

testing against passing of the Black beer bill; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

10539. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of J. D. Stewart and 42 other residents of New Sheffield, Beaver County, Pa., urging the defeat of all bills that propose the repeal of the eighteenth amendment or modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10540. Also, petition of Mrs. Harvey Westlake, 109 Moreland Street, Aliquippa, Pa., and 125 other residents of Aliquippa, urging the defeat of any and all bills that propose the repeal of eighteenth amendment or modification of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10541. By Mr. WHITE: Resolution of council of the city of Toledo memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 191 and Senate Joint Resolution 105, commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization of Brevet Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a hero of the Revolutionary War, by issuing a special series of postage stamps; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1933

(Legislative day of Saturday, February 18, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haligan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 14643) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would like to suggest the absence of a quorum if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Couzens	King	Sheppard
Austin	Cutting	La Follette	Shipstead
Bailey	Dale	Logan	Shortridge
Bankhead	Davis	Long	Smith
Barbour	Dickinson	McGill	Smoot
Barkley	Dill	McKellar	Steiner
Bingham	Fess	McNary	Stephens
Black	Fletcher	Metcalf	Swanson
Borah	Frazier	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	George	Neely	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Glass	Norbeck	Townsend
Bulkeley	Goldsborough	Norris	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Grammer	Oddie	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Patterson	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Pittman	Walcott
Carey	Hayden	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Clark	Howell	Reynolds	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hull	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Coolidge	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	White
Copeland	Kean	Russell	
Costigan	Kendrick	Schuyler	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14199) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference

with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REED. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the request for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. REED, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. STEINER, Mr. CUTTING, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. FLETCHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1932, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Library.

PRINTING OF RECORD IN UTILITIES INVESTIGATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission calling attention to the fact that about January 1, 1933, work stopped coming through on the printing and binding of the record in the utilities investigation, being conducted in response to Senate resolutions, and stating that the commission is informed that this publishing work has ceased due to lack of funds for its continuance, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

House Joint Memorial 6

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there is now on your calendar a House bill (H. R. 11816) having for its purpose, among other things, the conservation and protection of public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; and

Whereas the said House bill provided further for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the non timbered public lands of the United States, exclusive of Alaska, chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, with such reservations as are necessary to not interfere with like lands situate in national parks and monuments and Indian reservations; and

Whereas favorable consideration and passage of this House bill will serve to foster and stabilize the livestock industry, which is now dependent upon public range: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That we do most earnestly petition and memorialize the House of Representatives of the United States, in the name of the State of Oregon, to favorably consider pending legislation hereinbefore referred to; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Oregon be, and he hereby is, instructed to mail a copy of this resolution to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of its House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Oregon in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house January 31, 1933.

E. W. SNELL,
Speaker of the House.

Concurred in by the senate February 10, 1933.

FRED E. KIDDLE,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: House Joint Memorial No. 6 (introduced by Mr. Snider).

W. F. DRAGER, Chief Clerk.

Filed February 13, 1933.

HAL E. HOSS, Secretary of State.

STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Hal E. Hoss, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of House Joint Memorial No. 6 with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state February 13, 1933, and that the same is a full, true, and correct transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon. Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 14th day of February, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

HAL E. HOSS,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing Congress not to pass House bill 13558, relative to filing of notices of location of mineral claims in United States land offices, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. PITTMAN.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the passage of the so-called Frazier farm relief bill, being the bill (S. 1197) to liquidate and refinance agricultural indebtedness and to encourage and promote agriculture, commerce, and industry by establishing an efficient credit system, through which the unjust and unequal burdens placed upon agriculture during the period of price fixing and deflation may be lightened, by providing for the liquidation and refinancing of farm mortgages and farm indebtedness at a reduced rate of interest through the Federal farm-loan system, the Federal reserve banking system, and the postal-savings depository system, and creating a board of agriculture to supervise the same, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. BORAH.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate telegrams in the nature of petitions from Edith T. Morris, Mary L. Morris, and James Craik Morris, the Thirteenth Ward Independent Democratic Organization, Clyde Bel, president; Catherine R. Moore; the board of directors of the Consumers League of Louisiana, Mrs. Joseph E. Friend, president; Shirley Wimberly, attorney at law; Rena Crawford, M. D., and R. Williamson, M. D., and the Jackson Democratic Club, Francis Williams, president, all of New Orleans; J. B. Ardis, George W. Hardy, jr., Pike Hall, W. A. Mabry, E. Wayles Brown, Howard B. Warren, Robert G. Chandler, Harney S. Bogan, W. T. Mayo, Cecil Morgan, Joe B. Hamiter, and W. G. McElroy, all of Shreveport, and W. H. Hodges, jr., of Elm Grove, all in the State of Louisiana, praying for a continuance of the investigation of the Louisiana senatorial election of 1932, and the necessary allotment of money therefor by the special committee of the Senate to investigate campaign expenditures of the various presidential, vice presidential, and senatorial candidates in 1932, which were referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Hammond, Ind.; the City Council of Baltimore, Md.; the Common Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich.; the Board of Aldermen of the City of Newport, R. I.; the Common Council of the City of West Allis, Wis.; and the Common Council of the City of Cheyenne, Wyo., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps, of the denomination of 3 cents, commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen and appointment as brevet brigadier general of the Continental Army of Thaddeus Kosciuszko on October 13, 1783, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from Walter R. Rennecke, of Seattle, Wash., relative to intergovernmental debt settlements and corporation matters, and making certain suggestions in connection therewith, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BORAH presented the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Franklin Girard, secretary of state of the State of Idaho and legal custodian of the original enrolled copies of all acts passed at the various sessions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed constitute a full, true, and complete transcript of the original enrolled copy of House Joint Memorial No. 6, enacted by the twenty-second session of the Leg-

islature of the State of Idaho and filed in this office the 14th day of February, 1933.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 14th day of February, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

FRANKLIN GIRARD,
Secretary of State.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

House Joint Memorial 6 (by agriculture committee)

A joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled.

Received and filed February 14, 1933.

FRANKLIN GIRARD,
Secretary of State.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

House Joint Memorial 6 (by agriculture committee)

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas a crisis exists and hundreds of thousands of once prosperous farmers in this Nation have already lost their homes and their all by mortgage foreclosures because of the fact that the price of agricultural products has for years been below the cost of production, a condition that affects all of the people of this Nation and is largely responsible for the continuance of the depression; and

Whereas there is no adequate way of refinancing existing agricultural indebtedness and the farmers are at the mercy of their mortgagees and creditors; and

Whereas unless immediate relief is given, thousand and hundreds of thousands of additional farmers will lose their farms and their homes and millions more will be forced into our cities and villages, and the army of unemployed will necessarily increase to alarming proportions, precipitating a condition that threatens the very life of this Nation; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress Senate Bill No. 1197, known as the Frazier bill, which provides that existing farm indebtedness shall be refinanced by the Government of the United States at 1½ per cent interest and 1½ per cent principal on the amortization plan, not by issuing bonds and plunging the Nation further into debt, but by issuing Federal reserve notes the same as the Government now does for the banks through the Federal reserve bank: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, the Senate concurring, respectfully requests and petitions the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to enact said Senate bill No. 1197 in order that the agricultural indebtedness of the Nation may be speedily liquidated and refinanced and agriculture saved from utter ruin and destruction; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho is hereby directed to forward copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

This house joint memorial passed the house on the 4th day of February, 1933.

ROBERT COULTER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This house joint memorial passed the senate on the 10th day of February, 1933.

GEO. E. HILL, President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within House Joint Memorial No. 6 originated in the house of representatives during the twenty-second session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

DONALD D. STEWART,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BORAH presented the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Franklin Girard, secretary of state of the State of Idaho and legal custodian of the original enrolled copies of all acts passed at the various sessions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the annexed constitute a full, true, and complete transcript of the original enrolled copy of Senate Joint Memorial No. 4, enacted by the twenty-second session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho and filed in this office the 13th day of February, 1933.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State. Done at Boise, the capital of Idaho, this 13th day of February, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

FRANKLIN GIRARD,
Secretary of State.

IN THE SENATE.

Senate Joint Memorial 4 (by Kirkpatrick and Donart)

A joint memorial to the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Received and filed February 13, 1933.

FRANKLIN GIRARD,
Secretary of State.

IN THE SENATE.

Senate Joint Memorial 4 (by Kirkpatrick and Donart)

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

Whereas by reason of the great depreciation in the price of farm products and the inability of farmers to market the products of their farms in an amount to equal the cost of production, irrigation districts, duly organized and existing in conformity with the laws of the State wherein such districts are situate, and which districts were organized at the request of and under contracts made with the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes of management and for the purposes of collecting and paying the costs of constructing irrigation works by the Department of Reclamation of the Government of the United States, are unable to collect the assessments for the operation and maintenance of such irrigation district canals and diversion works and to pay the costs incurred in the diversion and distribution of the water to farms in such districts; and

Whereas by reason of said inability to collect such assessments and the inability of the farmers in said districts to pay, from the sale of the products of their farms, the costs of such operation and maintenance, such districts have been forced to issue and sell warrants of the districts legally issued for such expense for the year 1932, which are outstanding and unpaid; and

Whereas it will be necessary, in order to pay such operating expenses so that the farmers within such districts may be able to carry on their farms, for such irrigation districts to issue warrants for the payment of such expenses during the year 1933, which warrants can not be paid until the crops of 1933 are marketed; and

Whereas said warrants are a general lien upon the lands and water rights of such irrigation districts together with the interest thereon and are a first lien on said lands and said water rights, subject only to the lien of the Department of Reclamation of the Government of the United States for construction purposes, and will be paid as soon as the price of farm products is increased above the cost of production and the 1933 crops can be marketed; and

Whereas it is necessary that money be obtained for the operation and maintenance of said districts and to pay the cost for the distribution of water to said farms for the year 1933, if crops are to be produced on said lands; and

Whereas under the act of the Congress of the United States approved July 21, 1932, known as the "emergency relief and construction act of 1932," and the act of which it was an amendment, loans can not be made to such irrigation districts for the purposes herein provided; and

Whereas the interests of the thousands of farmers in said irrigation districts require that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may make loans for such purpose and accept the warrants of such districts as securities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to immediately broaden the terms of said act, by amendment thereto, under which loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may be made so as to include loans to such irrigation districts for such purpose, accepting as security therefor the warrants of said districts legally issued and registered in the manner provided by law, the payments of which, together with interest thereon, shall be guaranteed by assessments duly levied or to be levied as provided by law; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 6th day of February, 1933.

GEO. E. HILL,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 9th day of February, 1933.

ROBERT COULTER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within Senate Joint Memorial No. 4 originated in the senate during the twenty-second session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

M. J. HAMMOND,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, favoring the prompt passage of House bill 413, as amended, to enlarge the Boise National Forest by adding thereto certain areas in Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(See joint memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 15th instant, p. 4108, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. BORAH also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, urging Congress to eliminate from pending legislation (being a bill to amend sections 5

and 8 of the Idaho admission act so as to permit mineral leases on public lands to be made for a term not to exceed 20 years and to permit the further exchange and consolidation of State and Federal lands within the State of Idaho) the provision authorizing the State, in its discretion, to add a portion of the annual income to the permanent funds and, upon the elimination of this provision, favoring the immediate enactment into law of the said bill, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(See joint resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 14th instant, p. 3993, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. PITTMAN presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

STATE OF NEVADA,

Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Greathouse, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original Senate Joint Resolution 10, introduced by Senators Winters, Carpenter, and Friedhoff February 1, 1933, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 16th day of February, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State.

Senate joint resolution memorializing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to reduce the interest rate on, and to extend the time for payment of, agricultural and livestock loans

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of Nevada, That—

Whereas the present interest rates charged by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation in the State of Nevada are excessive under present conditions and should be lowered to at least 4 per cent per annum; and

Whereas said loans made are required to be approved by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Now, therefore

The Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby respectfully requests the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to reduce the rate of interest on all pending agricultural and livestock loans, and all future loans, to at least 4 per cent per annum, and to extend time for payment of the principal on present loans for an additional three years, and to make all future loans for not less than three years.

The secretary of state of the State of Nevada is hereby directed to transmit certified copies hereof to the president or chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to the executive officer of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation for this Federal land-bank district, and to the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Nevada.

MORLEY GRISWOLD,
President of the Senate.
V. R. MERIALDO,
Secretary of the Senate.
FRED S. ALWARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
GEORGE BRODIGAN,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

STATE OF NEVADA,
Executive Department.

Approved February 15, 1933.

F. B. BALZAR, Governor.

Mr. PITTMAN also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

STATE OF NEVADA,

Department of State, ss:

I, W. G. Greathouse, the duly elected, qualified, and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full, and correct copy of the original assembly joint resolution No. 10, introduced by Mr. Bugbee, January 30, 1933, now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of State, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 16th day of February, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

W. G. GREATHOUSE,
Secretary of State.

Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress not to pass H. R. 13558, relative to filing of notices of location of mining claims in United States land offices

Resolved by the assembly and the senate, That—

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States a bill, known as H. R. 13558, which provides for the filing of notices of location of all mineral claims in land offices of the United States, and

that proofs of labor on such mining claims be similarly filed, in addition to filing requirements now required under State laws, and that in case of failure to so file in the United States land offices all claims for which such filings have not been made shall be open to relocation in the same manner as if no location had ever been made on said claims, and granting the Secretary of the Interior power to prescribe rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the act, and requiring the payment of such fees for filing all papers required to be filed under the provisions of the proposed law; and

Whereas as almost all of the public lands within the State of Nevada are potential mineral lands, and thousands of mining claims now located on them, or which may be hereafter located thereon, have not been and can not be so described in the location notices, that these claims could not be placed upon a map without a long, tedious, and expensive survey, much of the mineral land being as yet unsurveyed and unplatted, and as such claims are held by citizens or may be located by others who are unable to bear the expense of surveying them and paying the filing fees to be required, especially in the present economic condition of the country; and

Whereas the provisions of such proposed law by Congress are unjust and wholly unnecessary and would work great hardship upon the prospectors and owners of mining claims: Now, therefore

The Legislature of the State of Nevada earnestly protests against the passage of said bill, namely, H. R. 13558, and requests that the Senators and Representatives of the State of Nevada in Congress oppose said bill and vote against the passage of the same, and that the Congress of the United States take cognizance of this protest and defeat the passage of said bill. The secretary of state of the State of Nevada is hereby instructed to forward a certified copy of this joint resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the United States Senators and Representative in Congress from the State of Nevada.

FRED S. ALWARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
GEORGE BRODIGAN,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
MORLEY GRISWOLD,
President of the Senate.
V. R. MERRILLDO,
Secretary of the Senate.

STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

Approved February 15, 1933, 3.40 p. m.

F. B. BALZAR, Governor.

Mr. KENDRICK presented the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, A. M. Clark, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of original Senate Joint Memorial No. 1, as passed by the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming and approved February 2, 1933, at 4.40 p. m.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 15th day of February, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

A. M. CLARK, Secretary of State.
By C. J. ROGERS, Deputy.

Memorializing Congress to take favorable action on S. 1043, to confer upon the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho the right to tax, for State and county purposes, persons, copartnerships, and corporations, and their property within that portion of the Yellowstone National Park which lies within the boundary lines of said States

Whereas the Yellowstone National Park was created and the boundaries thereof were defined by act of Congress dated March 1, 1872, as amended by act of Congress dated May 7, 1894, and as so created and established includes within its boundaries areas of the States of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho; and

Whereas in the act creating Yellowstone National Park and providing rules and regulations therefor no special provision has been made authorizing the assessment and collection of taxes upon property in private ownership included within the boundaries of said park; and

Whereas there now exists in private ownership a large amount of property situated within the boundaries of said Yellowstone National Park aggregating millions of dollars in value, the taxation of which would greatly benefit said States of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho; and

Whereas the various acts of Congress establishing the several national parks, including Glacier National Park, Sequoia National Park, Yosemite National Park, Mount Rainier National Park, and Rocky Mountain National Park, each expressly authorizes the taxation of property in private ownership situated within the boundaries thereof, and no good reason exists why such law should not be applied to the Yellowstone National Park; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a bill known as S. 1043 to confer upon the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho the right to tax for State and county purposes persons, copartnerships, and corporations, and their property within that portion of the Yellowstone National Park which lies within the boundary lines of said States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to take favorable and prompt action upon and to pass said S. 1043; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this joint memorial be sent to each of the members of the congressional delegation of this State in Congress and to the House of Representatives and Senate of the States of Montana and Idaho.

WM. M. JACK,
Speaker of the House.
ROY H. CAMERON,
President of the Senate.

Approved 4.40 p. m., February 2, 1933.

LESLIE A. MILLER, Governor.

Mr. KENDRICK also presented the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Wyoming, ss:

I, A. M. Clark, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of enrolled Joint Memorial No. 1, House of Representatives of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original House Joint Memorial No. 4, approved by the governor on February 16, 1933, at 8.55 a. m.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 16th day of February, A. D. 1933.

[SEAL.]

A. M. CLARK, Secretary of State.
By C. J. ROGERS, Deputy.

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to immediately enact legislation regulating interstate commercial motor-vehicle traffic

Whereas the ever-increasing burden of traffic by commercial motor vehicles operating for gain and profit upon the highways presents a serious situation; and

Whereas it is entirely clear that the highways are public property, that their primary and preferred use is for private purposes, and that their use for purposes of gain is special and extraordinary; and

Whereas it is vitally important to the State of Wyoming that traffic by commercial motor vehicles shall be so regulated that the burden thereof with its resulting injuries to the highways, its interference with the primary use thereof, as well as the danger and inconvenience resulting to the citizens of the State shall be properly adjusted to the interests of all classes of citizens; and

Whereas such regulation should be designed to foster a fair distribution of traffic, to the end that all necessary facilities of transportation shall be maintained and the public shall not be inconvenienced by the extraordinary and unlimited use of the highways for purposes of gain and profit; and

Whereas such regulation through legislative enactment by the State of Wyoming can result only in the regulation of such traffic upon the highways within this State and can not properly accomplish such regulation with reference to such traffic which is interstate in character; and

Whereas it is necessary, in order to make any such regulation by legislative enactment of this State effective, that there shall be enacted by the Congress of the United States legislation regulating interstate traffic by commercial motor vehicles upon the highways: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the twenty-second legislature (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to immediately enact legislation regulating interstate traffic by common-carrier motor vehicles upon the highways and the business of operating such vehicle upon the highways for gain and profit, and to the end that the burden of such traffic with its resulting injuries to the highways, its interference with the primary use of the highways, the danger and inconvenience resulting to the citizens shall be properly adjusted to the interest of all classes of citizens, and that all necessary facilities of transportation shall be maintained and the public shall not be inconvenienced by the extraordinary and unlimited use of the highways for the purposes of gain and profit; be it further

Resolved, That certified copy of this memorial be addressed and sent to Senator ROBERT D. CAREY, Senator JOHN B. KENDRICK, and Hon. VINCENT CARTER, Representative in Congress for the State of Wyoming.

ROY H. CAMERON,
President of the Senate.
WM. M. JACK,
Speaker of the House.

Approved 8.55 a. m., February 16, 1933.

LESLIE A. MILLER, Governor.

Mr. KENDRICK also presented the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

State of Wyoming, ss:

I, A. M. Clark, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the annexed is a full, true, and correct copy of Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 2, House of Representatives of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming, being original House Joint Memorial No. 3, approved by the governor on February 16, 1933, at 9 a. m.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 16th day of February, A. D. 1933.

A. M. CLARK, Secretary of State.
By C. J. ROGERS, Deputy.

Memorializing the National Park Service to maintain the public roads in Yellowstone National Park, so as to permit winter travel thereon

Whereas the roads traversing Yellowstone National Park are not now maintained for winter travel; and

Whereas there are highly developed highways which converge through Yellowstone National Park, all of which are open for constant use during the winter but are barred from use for transcontinental travel by reason of the failure of the National Park Service to maintain its highways so as to permit winter travel; and

Whereas the distance from Chicago to San Francisco would be shortened by 500 miles and the distance from Chicago to Portland would be shortened by 1,500 miles for winter traffic if the roads of Yellowstone National Park were maintained for winter travel; and

Whereas there are thousands of the motoring public who make the trip between the places above designated and intermediate points during the winter months and that by reason of the lessening of mileage if winter travel were possible through Yellowstone National Park, they would be able to save millions of dollars annually; and

Whereas there are thousands of people who are desirous of viewing the canyon, falls, hot springs, and geysers of Yellowstone National Park in their winter beauty; and

Whereas the main routes of travel through Yellowstone National Park are protected by timber, making them easily kept free from snow and safe for transcontinental travel during the winter months; and

Whereas greater snowfalls than are prevalent in Yellowstone National Park are removed from high passes in the States of Colorado, California, Washington, and Oregon, thereby proving that winter maintenance is possible and feasible in Yellowstone National Park; and

Whereas there is no other short stretch of highway now closed for winter travel that would command as much thereof as the one via Yellowstone National Park; and

Whereas by the collection of the fee charged for entering the park the National Park Service would receive sufficient to pay the expense of snow removal and winter maintenance and also afford winter labor for many now unemployed; and

Whereas many other national parks are kept open during the entire winter months: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That we hereby memorialize the National Park Service of the United States of America that they take such favorable, necessary, and prompt action as will result in the annual winter maintenance of highways in Yellowstone National Park; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this house joint memorial be forwarded to the Wyoming Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to the Director of the National Park Service.

ROY H. CAMERON,
President of the Senate.
WM. M. JACK,
Speaker of the House.

Approved 9 a. m., February 16, 1933.

LESLIE A. MILLER, Governor.

Mr. KING presented a resolution adopted by the Logan (Utah) City Commission, protesting against the imposition of taxes upon publicly owned utilities of States or political subdivisions thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COPELAND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oswego and Rochester, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of legislation to reevaluate the gold ounce so as to expand the currency, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the village of Pleasantville, Westchester County, N. Y., protesting against the imposition of taxes on State

and municipal-owned utilities, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Camp No. 55, Patriotic Order of Americans, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the so-called Federal economy law and especially protesting against the operation of the furlough plan affecting Government employees, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials and communications in the nature of memorials of sundry citizens and several religious organizations in the State of New York, remonstrating against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution or the repeal or modification of the national prohibition law, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of Local No. 108, Upholsterers, Carpet and Linoleum Mechanics' International Union of North America, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the passage of the bill (S. 5125) to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions of the Plattsburgh (N. Y.) Chapter, Reserve Officers' Association of America, protesting against inclusion in the War Department appropriation measure of the so-called Connery amendment affecting the pay of officers on the retired list of the Army, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions of the Plattsburgh (N. Y.) Chapter, Reserve Officers' Association of America, protesting against the passage of the so-called McClintic bill, being House bill 13522, relating to the retirement of certain employees of the Government, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13991) to aid agriculture and relieve the existing national economic emergency, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1251) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5622) providing for an alternate budget for the Indian Service, fiscal year 1935, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1252) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) authorizing the fixing of grazing fees on lands within national forests, reported it without amendment.

Mr. STEIWER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 5607) authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances to the reclamation fund, reported it without amendment.

Mr. DALE, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 5475) to amend section 3 of the act of May 28, 1928, relating to salary rates of certain civil-service positions, reported it without amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the bill (S. 5614) authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances to the reclamation fund, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1254) thereon.

Mr. SCHUYLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 194) to amend section 6 of the national charter of the Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1253) thereon.

Mr. WALSH of Montana, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 10641. An act to amend section 122 of the Judicial Code (Rept. No. 1255);

H. R. 10243. An act granting the consent of Congress to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts

for cooperative effort and mutual assistance in the prevention of crime, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1256); and S. 1060. An act relative to assumption of risks of employment (Rept. No. 1257).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on the 18th instant that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 567. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. certain tracts of land situate in the county of Harford and State of Maryland;

S. 1705. An act for the relief of Samuel C. Davis; and

S. 4576. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant an easement for railroad right of way over and upon a portion of the helium gas bearing lands of the United States of America in Potter County, in the State of Texas.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 5665) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Burrell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAREY:

A bill (S. 5666) granting an honorable discharge to Edward Barrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5667) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to grant a permit for the construction of an oil and gasoline pipe line; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 5668) granting a pension to Ella A. Barker;

A bill (S. 5669) granting a pension to Margaret A. Srout; and

A bill (S. 5670) granting an increase of pension to Sarah V. Ashcraft; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5671) to amend the act of May 25, 1926, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 5672) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia by the taxation of beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 5673) to amend section 30 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, with respect to disclosure of confidential information in the files of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 5674) to provide for the issuance of stamped money certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NATIONAL AND STATE BANKING INSTITUTIONS

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I ask leave to introduce a joint resolution and have it referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and because of the interest in the subject I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 256) authorizing the Comptroller of the Currency to exercise with respect to national banking associations powers which State officials may have with respect to State banks, savings banks, and/or trust companies under State laws, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller of the Currency shall have and may exercise to such extent as he deems advisable with respect to national banking associations any powers which the State officials

having supervision of State banks, savings banks, and/or trust companies in the State in which such national banking associations are located may have with respect to such State institutions under State laws now in force or hereafter enacted: *Provided*, That nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to extend the authority of the Comptroller of the Currency under section 5155, as amended, of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches of national banking associations.

Expenses incurred by the Comptroller of the Currency in the exercise of such powers may be assessed by him against the banks concerned and, when so assessed, shall be paid by such banks.

Nothing herein shall be construed to impair any power otherwise possessed by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Federal Reserve Board.

All powers conferred herein shall terminate on March 3, 1934.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 14643) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONTINUANCE OF INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL FARM BOARD

Mr. McNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 364), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 42, Seventy-second Congress, agreed to April 11, 1932, directing the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make an investigation of the activities and operations of the Federal Farm Board, is hereby continued in full force and effect until the expiration of the Seventy-third Congress.

COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS RELATING TO THE WOOD-PULP INDUSTRY

Mr. DILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 365), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That the Tariff Commission be, and is hereby, directed to investigate and report to the Senate at as early a date as possible the competitive conditions as they relate to the wood-pulp industry of the United States, and particularly in relation to pulp timber, pulpwood, and mechanical and chemical wood pulp produced in Canada, Sweden, Finland, and Norway, said investigation to be based upon the costs in the various countries as computed on the standard gold value of United States currency used in payment for labor and other costs in domestic industry.

The commission is further directed to make such use of the data and findings of the United States Conservation Board, which has conducted a complete survey in the domestic field of the pulp business during the past few years, as will be useful in making its report to the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who announced that on the 18th instant the President approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1858. An act for the relief of Harriette Olsen; and

S. 4166. An act for the relief of James M. Griffin, disbursing agent, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

ADDRESS BY GEN. JOHN R. KING ON LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I ask leave to have published in the RECORD an address delivered on Lincoln's Birthday over a national broadcast from Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 11, 1933, by Gen. John R. King, past commander in chief, Grand Army of the Republic.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, whenever the patriotic citizens of any nation join in tribute to the memory of those who were willing to sacrifice themselves for a conception of public duty, the whole human mass moves forward in the way of brotherhood.

As past commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, I am profoundly grateful to the National Broadcasting Co. and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for this opportunity to extend the hand of comradeship and brotherhood to those of our younger comrades of the war with Spain, the World War, and all other campaigns and expeditions under the flag we love so well.

It is eminently fitting and proper that this program should be dedicated to the ideals and principles that characterized the life of Abraham Lincoln. To-night, on the eve of the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of Lincoln's humble birth in the backwoods of Kentucky, there is a special significance in the

knowledge that we, as a united Nation, can still find courage and inspiration in his words and teachings.

To-day, under the stress of world-wide economic disturbances and widespread suffering, humanity in general is sorely in need of the healing hand of Abraham Lincoln. He was a man who belonged to the people; whose view on issues pertaining to the public welfare was tempered with tolerance and sympathy for the masses; one who possessed a deep sense of loyalty to the inherent rights of individuals and a wholesome regard for the well-being of those who were prepared to sacrifice themselves on the altar of patriotism.

To-day, due to circumstances brought on by an economic upheaval, there are those who would ignore and forget the teachings and principles of patriotism, and appreciation of service as emphasized by Abraham Lincoln. Veterans as a class have become the target of insidious and underhand attacks. Motives that are utterly selfish have inspired certain cliques and groups to vent their spleen upon the veteran and his dependents, irrespective of the service, sacrifice, and sufferings they have been willing to undergo as loyal citizens of this Nation.

In reply to these critics of the veteran, I take the words of Abraham Lincoln, when he said, "Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction. * * * Let us have the faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

As past commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, I hereby pledge the prayers and energies of our organization to the cause of veteran unity. We are old in years but still young in spirit in this fight against those who would exploit the veteran in the name of false economy. We have no patience for those who would weigh the value of mere dollars against the welfare and happiness of human beings.

To the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in its glorious defense of veteran legislative benefits already enacted, I pledge the loyal aid and support of our fast-fading ranks. To the people, as a whole, we who survive in the ranks of the Grand Army of the Republic commend the ideals and principles espoused by the Great Emancipator when he called upon a united people, following the Civil War, "to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphans."

May God make us worthy of the memory of Abraham Lincoln!

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that on to-day the House passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 211) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

FEDERAL AID FOR UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 5125) to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, and for other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the issue presented to the Senate between the substitute offered by the Senator from New York and the Costigan-La Follette bill is clear-cut. Every line of the substitute, beginning on page 3, line 17, down to and including line 5 on page 9, was adopted to the pending bill last Friday. These are the provisions of the Wagner substitute which deal with loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for public works. The first part of the substitute, to be found on pages 1 and 2 and down to line 17 on page 3, deals with funds to be made available for the relief of destitution. They provide for a continuation of the present policy of loaning money or making advances to the States, to be deducted from future Federal highway appropriations. These deductions are to begin in 1935. All that the substitute offered by the Senator from New York does, in so far as relief of the unemployed is concerned, is to raise the authorized limit of such loans to \$600,000,000 and to change the pauper's oath which the governors must now make by omitting the phrase in the existing law requiring a declaration that there are no resources within the State to meet the problem.

WAGNER SUBSTITUTE WILL CONTINUE PRESENT DISGRACEFULLY LOW RELIEF STANDARDS

There remains about \$133,000,000 of the \$300,000,000 authorized for loans and advances for relief of destitution in the bill passed last year. Therefore it is fair to say that the Wagner substitute does nothing to raise the prevailing standards of relief being given to the unemployed and their dependents. It proposes to continue the disgracefully low levels of subsistence which are forcing a degradation of mil-

lions of men, women, and children spiritually, mentally, and physically in the United States to-day.

THE COSTIGAN-LA FOLLETTE BILL

The Costigan-La Follette bill on the other hand provides \$500,000,000 to be given as a grant in aid to the States to meet in part the burden of direct unemployment relief. This fund is to be raised by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and will be administered by a Federal emergency relief board of three persons to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, two of whom shall be experienced in public relief and welfare administration.

Mr. President, I ask for order in the Chamber. I ask that Senators who are not interested in the misery of millions in the United States retire to the cloakroom to carry on their conversations.

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping for order). Senators will please be in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The fund proposed in the bill is made available as rapidly as it may be needed. Forty per cent of the total, or \$200,000,000, is, according to sections 4 (a) and (7) of the bill, to be apportioned according to the population of the various States, Territories, and the District of Columbia. The maximum amounts available to individual States and Territories on this basis are shown in the following table, which I ask be incorporated as a part of my remarks and which are to be found in the report of the Committee on Manufactures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

State	Population	Amount
United States.....	124,746,573	\$200,000,000.00
Alabama.....	2,646,248	4,242,598.32
Alaska.....	59,278	95,037.48
Arizona.....	435,573	698,332.60
Arkansas.....	1,854,482	2,973,199.10
California.....	5,677,251	9,102,055.25
Colorado.....	1,035,791	1,660,632.38
Connecticut.....	1,606,903	2,576,267.96
Delaware.....	238,380	382,182.84
District of Columbia.....	486,869	780,572.94
Florida.....	1,468,211	2,353,909.96
Georgia.....	2,908,506	4,663,063.58
Hawaii.....	368,336	590,534.86
Idaho.....	445,032	713,497.74
Illinois.....	7,630,654	12,233,849.51
Indiana.....	3,238,503	5,192,131.42
Iowa.....	2,470,939	3,961,534.08
Kansas.....	1,880,999	3,015,712.50
Kentucky.....	2,614,589	4,191,814.00
Louisiana.....	2,101,593	3,369,379.94
Maine.....	797,423	1,278,468.78
Maryland.....	1,631,526	2,615,744.80
Massachusetts.....	4,249,614	6,843,195.60
Michigan.....	4,842,325	7,763,459.77
Minnesota.....	2,563,953	4,110,659.82
Mississippi.....	2,009,821	3,222,240.44
Missouri.....	3,629,367	5,818,784.30
Montana.....	537,606	861,917.06
Nebraska.....	1,377,963	2,209,219.80
Nevada.....	91,058	145,988.70
New Hampshire.....	465,293	745,981.20
New Jersey.....	4,041,334	6,479,279.58
New Mexico.....	423,317	678,693.16
New York.....	12,588,066	20,181,822.50
North Carolina.....	3,170,276	5,082,746.44
North Dakota.....	680,845	1,091,565.04
Ohio.....	6,646,697	10,656,320.01
Oklahoma.....	2,596,040	3,841,452.22
Oregon.....	953,786	1,529,157.84
Pennsylvania.....	9,631,350	15,441,466.30
Puerto Rico.....	1,543,913	2,475,279.22
Rhode Island.....	687,497	1,102,229.88
South Carolina.....	1,738,765	2,787,675.78
South Dakota.....	692,849	1,110,810.46
Tennessee.....	2,616,556	4,194,994.60
Texas.....	5,824,715	9,338,476.99
Utah.....	507,847	814,205.92
Vermont.....	359,611	576,546.50
Virginia.....	2,421,851	3,882,833.72
Washington.....	1,563,396	2,506,515.34
West Virginia.....	1,729,205	2,772,348.70
Wisconsin.....	2,930,006	4,711,962.72
Wyoming.....	225,565	361,637.18

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, to provide an incentive to a maximum of effort on the part of the States and localities, payments to any State on the population basis in any one calendar year are, under section 4 (a), not to exceed two-thirds of the amounts made available for relief from all sources within the State.

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping for order). Senators will please be in order. Senators desiring to carry on conversation will please retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The remainder of the Federal contribution, or \$300,000,000, except for necessary administrative expenses, which may not exceed \$350,000, is, according to sections 4 (b) and 8, together with any portion of the fund allotted on the basis of population but not used, according to section 4 (c), to be allotted to the States and Territories and the District of Columbia to the extent that local needs are not covered by local and State funds and the funds obtainable upon the population basis.

Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of the amount reserved for allotment in accordance with need may be used, under subsections (b) and (c) of section 8, to assist the States in establishing relief programs for transients who have no legal claim on the State or the local community in which they happen to be. Those provisions of the bill embody the essential provisions of the bill (S. 5121) to authorize cooperation by the Federal Government in relieving distress among unemployed needy transients, also referred to the Committee on Manufactures. The evidence taken by your committee shows that action by the Federal Government is imperative to meet the problem created by the ever-increasing number of men, women, and boys who are wandering about the country looking for work. And, in my judgment, Mr. President, the \$15,000,000 provided is adequate to deal with the transient problem that now confronts the country.

Full responsibility for the allocation of funds under the Costigan-La Follette bill is by section 3 vested in a Federal emergency relief board of three members, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to continue in existence for a period of two years. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under sections 2 and 9, is in effect designated as the board's fiscal agent. The corporation is directed to make to the States the payments certified from time to time by the board, and is authorized to sell additional bonds or debentures to the extent that this may be necessary to cover the expenditures of the relief program.

The procedure to govern applications by the States for grants is set forth in sections 5, 6, and 10. The bill avoids all implication of centralization of relief or Federal coercion of the States by explicitly stating in section 12 that it shall be construed—

To secure to the several States control of the administration of relief * * * within their respective territorial limits—

And in section 5 (b) that—

Relief shall be administered within each State under rules and regulations adopted by the State authorities.

It is fully recognized that this bill is in no sense a solution of the economic problems which have created the need for unemployment relief. It is urgent, however, that hunger, disease, discouragement, and permanent degradation be checked until effective measures for economic recovery can be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin has asked for order. Let the Senate be in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hope that the interruptions of this nature will remain in the RECORD, so that the millions of persons now ground down to the level of paupers may understand that in the highest legislative body in this land there is no interest in their suffering or their degradation.

SHRINKAGE OF RELIEF RESOURCES—PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

There are between twelve and fifteen million unemployed persons in the United States to-day. We are in the fourth winter of the depression. The longer it lasts the greater the load becomes upon relief. This is due to two causes. The exhaustion of the resources of the individual and the shrinkage of resources, public and private. Funds raised from private sources rose tremendously in the early stages of the depression; but, despite heroic efforts, they are rapidly becoming an insignificant factor. Available statistics indi-

cate that private funds are now meeting only about 12 per cent of the burden. In my judgment this does not reflect an unwillingness to be generous. It is due primarily to diminishing income and to some extent to the fact that private contributions are more readily available to meet an emergency, but tend to decline when the need extends over a period of years.

We have no accurate figures as to the number of families now on relief, but Harry L. Hopkins, chairman of the Temporary Relief Administration of New York State, testified that 300,000 families would require relief in that State this year. Upon the basis of his experience he estimated that 10 per cent of the population, or 3,000,000 families in the country, would require relief from public funds in 1933. Walter West, executive secretary of the American Association of Social Workers, estimates that between three and three and one-half million families are now on the destitute level and require relief.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation had, early in January, made loans or advances to 36 States and 2 Territories, which represent about 52 per cent of the population of the United States, but does not include New York, New Jersey, the five New England States, California, Maryland, Delaware, Nebraska, and Wyoming. In November last, according to Mr. Croxton, there were 2,300,000 families estimated to be in need of relief in the area referred to.

The mounting burden is shown by the Children's Bureau figures from 125 reporting cities, embracing 25 per cent of the population. In January, 1931, these cities had 450,000 families on relief; in December, 1931, there were 696,000; in November, 1932, 892,000; and in December last 997,000 families were receiving assistance in these 125 municipalities. New York City also shows the same increase in load: November, 1930, 27,000 families; November, 1931, 108,000; November, 1932, 178,000. Chicago has had a like experience: November, 1930, there were 16,500 families on relief; November, 1931, it had jumped to 97,000, and in November, 1932, it had reached 161,000. In that month there were 75,000 families down-State in Illinois, making a total for the State of 230,000 families entirely dependent on public relief. In Pennsylvania there were in December, 1931, 165,000 families on relief; in May, 1932, 235,000; and in December, 1932, 397,000 families in the State of Pennsylvania were on public relief. The load in that State is rising at the rate of 40,000 families per month.

Data received from 44 cities in 25 States and analyzed by H. L. Lurie, of the Bureau of Jewish Social Research, shows that 25 per cent of the unemployed in those cities are receiving relief.

FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND FAMILIES IN THE UNITED STATES ARE DESTITUTE

But let no Senator get the impression that all those who are in need are receiving even the meager assistance now being given to those in want. Mr. Hopkins, in charge of the relief in New York State, estimates that there are 500,000 families in the United States in destitute circumstances who are being denied relief because the available funds are inadequate to meet the need. There are, for example, estimated to be 30,000 families in New York City alone, the richest city in the world, who are in need, but who are unable to secure relief because of lack of funds. This is not a wild guess. It is made by Mr. William Hodson, executive director of the welfare council in that city.

Since the substitute offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] proposes to continue the present basis of relief in this country, it becomes pertinent to make a brief survey of the standards of relief that prevail in the richest country in the world. Relief does not meet the minimum standards set up by competent authorities as necessary to sustain life and preserve health and morale. I have time to cite only a few examples. Mr. Hodson testified:

We have not been able thus far to provide adequate relief. We have prevented families from starving to death and have met, in part, the most urgent distress. Beyond that we have not attained a standard which is adequate.

Mr. Samuel A. Goldsmith, executive director of Jewish charities in Chicago, testified:

We have been engaged in a great biological experiment in Illinois. We have been experimenting with the minimum amount of money and food that will keep people fairly healthy.

Calvert Estill, director of public welfare in West Virginia, tells the story in a few words:

The funds available both from Federal and local sources have been just about sufficient to maintain the families and keep them from starvation; nothing except food, practically no clothing, and no rents.

I asked him about medical care. He answered:

In the first grants made in 1932 we permitted the same medical and hospital services on a case basis; that is, if the case was in all respects eligible to assistance. In the grants that were made to us for the year 1933 in the resolution adopted by the corporation (Reconstruction Finance Corporation) there is a provision to the effect that it is understood that funds are not available for medical, hospital, or institutional services.

The relief given to-day does not even reach the standards set up to aid the victims of disaster. Again I quote from Walter West, of the American Association of Social Workers:

We had had some disaster-relief experience which we applied and that we are applying now, unfortunately. Our disaster programs were proper following a tornado or fire or flood. We had learned to bring in supplies and hand them out, register the afflicted and the persons who had been dispossessed, and we have been able to apply those systems quite adequately in particular local places. But those systems of relief are not the kind to meet the needs of families which have to be relieved month after month and year after year.

We have made it necessary for those families to live on inadequate food allowances on which they might be able to live reasonably well for a week or two, but without the variety that is absolutely necessary in a year's or a month's diet. We have left them every month with uncertainty and a fear of being dispossessed. We have given little clothing, although we always provide clothing in disasters. We do not provide medical care through a central relief agency, although we give it in disasters. We are cutting off lights and giving inadequate heat. Our relief programs are not even as adequate now as in any disaster relief program of which I know.

The estimate for needs in Illinois by the State commission is \$92,000,000 for 1933. According to Samuel Goldsmith this is on a disaster basis. He said:

It fails to recognize that no one has ever experienced a prolonged "disaster" for three or four years. We are simply keeping people alive in this situation.

Even these standards, disgracefully low as they are, are being lowered. I refer to the testimony of Mr. Lurie again.

In a large number of cities which give food relief through commissaries and grocery orders adequate standards of diet are not being maintained and increasingly even the supplying of food relief is taking on the character of emergency rations. It is obvious that such methods of relief may prove disastrous to health and morale as the emergency period lengthens into years instead of months. Very rapidly with diminishing funds it is becoming increasingly true that the efforts of relief agencies do not go much beyond the objective of seeing that "nobody will starve." * * * The supplying of food, however, is the only item of relief being given regularly in practically all of the cities. Payment of rent, clothing, fuel, light, and medical care are being given on an emergency basis—that is irregularly and to only a fraction of the unemployed."

A commission appointed by the Governor of Rhode Island recently reported:

It is especially important to recognize that there is a great difference between the amount which is needed to protect a family against desperate hunger for a few days and the amount that must be provided to carry a family for months on end. A food order for \$2 or \$3 prevents starvation, and for \$5 a week the food needs of a family may be met for several weeks. * * * But where no provision can be made for reestablishing the flow of income of the head of the family, the absolute minimum to hold the family intact (five persons) is about \$10 per week.

PRESENT RELIEF ON SEMISTARVATION BASIS

Senators who vote for the substitute bill are voting to maintain the present semistarvation basis of relief. In the time-limit I can give only a few examples, but they are all too typical.

Mr. Lurie, in referring to the reports from the cities he had studied, found that the relief ranges from as little as \$5 and \$6 a month for food relief in Florida, supplemented by a few miscellaneous items, such as wood, flour, and vegetables, to \$10 and \$12 per week for a family of five persons

in some of the cities of medium size that have more adequate funds. In general, he reported to the committee, between \$15 and \$20 a month per family would be the total average relief. He estimated that if a minimum budgetary standard including food, clothing, rent, light, heat, and medical care were to be given, it would be necessary for cities concerned in his report to double the present total relief expenditures.

I cite a few examples: Stamford, Conn., grocery orders of \$3, \$4, and \$5 per week; Grand Rapids, 50 cents per person per week; Cleveland, \$4.40 per week; Toledo, \$3 per week; Dallas, \$1.40 for one day's work per week; Seattle, \$4 per week; Cincinnati, \$4 per week; Philadelphia, \$4.54 per week; Pittsburgh, 90 cents per week per person. In the State of Pennsylvania the usual weekly family grant for food in December last was between \$3 and \$4. The maximum was \$4.50 per week, regardless of the size of the family. In West Virginia the average allowance per week to the needy and distressed has been between 70 and 80 cents.

It hardly needs further argument to demonstrate that the standard of relief has been lowered beyond the danger point. Of course, it means undernourishment, not only for adults but for children. Doctor Appel, of the State Health Department in Pennsylvania, reports an alarming increase in undernourishment of school children. It has risen from 10 per cent three years ago to 28 per cent to-day. Lack of funds for shoes and clothing is not only causing suffering among the adult unemployed, but in many instances children are unable to attend school. Mr. Pickett, of the Friends' committee, reports that warm clothing is practically nonexistent in the coal-mining areas where he has been at work.

The lack of sufficient funds has made it impossible for the agencies to supply fuel except in emergency cases. The meager funds do not allow for the payment of light and gas bills. The testimony is replete with statements that the use of kerosene and candles was resorted to because it was cheaper. In Chicago Miss Edith Abbott, a member of the relief administration, reported many cases where water has been cut off for lack of payment of water bills, although this is contrary to the sanitary code of the city.

The inadequacy of relief funds has resulted in an almost universal policy of paying rent only to prevent eviction, and in many communities rent is only paid to secure new quarters for the family for one month. This policy has resulted in overcrowding. It has contributed greatly to the ever-mounting tax delinquencies in cities, thus diminishing the resources of those cities. It is not at all uncommon for landlords who own considerable rental property to be forced to apply for relief because they have no income, due to inability to collect rent. The overcrowding is producing behavior and delinquency problems which are a menace to family life.

Doctor Billikopf estimates that there are 50,000 families who have not paid rent for periods ranging from six months to two years in Philadelphia. Mr. De Schweinitz estimated that 43 per cent of the families receiving relief in Philadelphia had moved at least twice in the last year. Speaking of the situation in Chicago, Miss Edith Abbott said:

The policy of the relief offices is to pay one month's rent in advance to get the family in a new flat. Then the story begins all over and over again, and families move and move. We have had families that have moved as many as ten times in a year. * * * I remember one little boy in court (renters') and who was very much surprised and a little disturbed by it, and he said, "We are just like gypsies, always moving all the time." And that situation, as I have said, is very demoralizing to children.

FAMILIES MUST NOW BECOME PAUPERIZED BEFORE RECEIVING RELIEF

Now, do not think, Senators, that even this semistarvation relief that is being provided in the United States is being given just because people are unemployed. Oh, no! It is given only after the applicant has been carefully investigated, and it has been found that he and his family have been stripped of all their worldly possessions. To my mind, the period of pauperization through which a family must pass before it is considered eligible to receive any relief at all is one of the most appalling aspects of the situation.

Hear Mr. Lurie on this point:

Homes are lost, insurance is canceled, aid from relatives and friends has been terminated, families are forced to exhaust and destroy indefinitely their credit before relief is granted to them. This statement on the degree of destitution reached before relief is granted is applicable in practically all communities.

I ask the Senators within the sound of my voice to picture what this means. You lose your job. Your savings keep the family going for a time. When they are gone, you borrow on your insurance. When it lapses you move to a 1-room flat. You borrow from your relatives and friends. You stand off the butcher and the grocer and the milkman until they will give you nothing more for your wife and children to eat. Finally, after months of anguish and despair, you apply for relief; and after a careful investigation you are granted a food order for \$4.50 per week. And this is all. No rent is paid unless you have been evicted from your shelter. There is no money for medical care or medicine except in emergency cases. The light is cut off. Gas is disconnected.

Perhaps the water will be shut off, too. There is no provision for clothing or shoes unless you are in dire straits, and then only secondhand cast-offs. I ask you, Will you ever be the same man again? Will your wife ever be the same woman again? And your children, what chance will they have in the future?

I say to you that by your failure to provide adequate relief to these citizens you are charging up a bill to the future in social problems and in problems of rehabilitation, the cost of which staggers the imagination.

The testimony shows that men who have been through this process of degradation and have had to subsist on these low levels of relief are no longer capable of a full day's work. Their physical stamina and their skill are gone. Time only will demonstrate whether it can ever be regained. To-day there are 3,000,000 families, or a tenth of the population, on this level; but the number is mounting at the rate of hundreds of thousands a month. Unless the standards of relief are raised, what is to become of the vaunted skill and productive capacity of the people of this country? Have you considered the permanent damage to the children who suffer malnutrition and are warped in body and mind?

In the passage of the emergency relief and reconstruction act last year we recognized that the Federal Government had a responsibility for unemployment relief, but we did not provide any contribution from the National Government to discharge it. We extended the facilities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and permitted it to act in the capacity of banker, loaning funds to the States and municipalities to meet the staggering burden of destitution relief.

RELIEF A NATIONAL PROBLEM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Regardless of the theories relating to the responsibility of the various governmental units in coping with the relief problem, the evidence now shows without doubt that unless the Federal Government assumes a part of the burden, relief will break down.

I have never been able to see upon what ground it can successfully be maintained that the problem of unemployment relief in a nation-wide economic collapse is solely the responsibility of State and local governments. Modern civilization has created an entirely different problem than existed before the industrial revolution. The theory that relief is only a local responsibility has become embedded in our thinking and our law because before the industrial revolution poor relief was administered in England by the village. The specialization and integration of industry have resulted in its concentration. Relief becomes in part a national problem and responsibility just as our industrial organization has become nation-wide in character.

It must be obvious that the concentration of industry and commerce has been attended by a like concentration of wealth and income. How can the financial burden of relief be carried alone by the local communities under such circumstances? It may be argued that the States with the greatest concentration of wealth and income are the States

that have the heaviest burden of relief, but it requires only a casual study to demonstrate that the State governments are in no position to tap the resources in their respective jurisdiction. Five States—Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California—have 36 per cent of the wealth of the Nation. New York has made a heroic effort to meet the problem of unemployment relief, and yet to-day the richest State in the Union finds it necessary to appeal to the Federal Government for assistance.

The same situation is presented in States where the wealth and industry is concentrated in a few counties. Would anyone contend that because of this situation the State had no responsibility and must not act to tap, in so far as possible, the resources of these counties to provide for unemployment relief in the other sections of the State?

Even though taxes are collected in certain particular States, they are derived from the products of the Nation as a whole. Take internal-revenue receipts as an example. About 54 per cent is collected from the five States just mentioned. These taxes include income, estate, distilled spirits, and tobacco. For an illustration, take the revenue from cigarettes: About 62 per cent is collected in North Carolina. It just happens that North Carolina has become the center of the cigarette industry. Can anyone claim that this revenue is due to the wealth or income of that State? Of course not! It is produced by cigarette consumption all over the United States.

To those who still cling to the theory that relief is a local responsibility I answer that we are no longer confronted by theories. We are confronted by the most appalling total of human misery in the history of any country in the world. Municipal resources are inadequate to meet the problems any longer. Take the situation of 279 municipalities, given your committee. They have raised their levies for relief from \$42,000,000 in 1929 to \$87,000,000 in 1932. During this period tax delinquencies in those cities have been rising at an alarming rate.

In other words, as the load increases, the resources to meet it decline. If we permit these two curves to go on separating for an indefinite period only bankruptcy and default will result. In the meantime other services rendered by these local units of government are impaired. Health, fire, and police protection and the operation of schools are threatened. To continue the present system of relief as proposed in the Wagner substitute will in the end contribute to a breakdown of municipal government. In the Senator's own State the municipalities can do no more, and have already petitioned the State for an increase in the proportion of the burden now assumed by the Commonwealth.

The same situation concerning resources is confronting the State governments. Like the cities, the States are largely dependent upon real-estate taxes for their revenue. Senators may ask why they do not turn to other sources. The answer is that in many of them there are constitutional restrictions which are not amendable except by a long process. There are constitutional restrictions on tax rates in 21 States. There are 16 States in which the State government is prohibited from loaning its credit to the local governments. There are 15 States that can not classify property taxes because of constitutional provisions.

TESTIMONY OF MAYORS

In a questionnaire sent out to the mayors of cities I asked the question as to whether the problem of relief could be met unless the Federal Government made an outright contribution to meet the situation. Of the more than 1,000 mayors, approximately, who answered, 616 mayors answered "no." Their cities have an aggregate population of over 24,000,000. I regret I can not take time to go into the other questions, but I ask to have the summary of their replies, together with a copy of the questionnaire printed at the conclusion of my remarks (Exhibit A).

One hundred mayors gathered here in Washington last week and adopted the following resolution:

Be it further resolved, That we recommend that the Federal Government assume a larger measure of financial responsibility in meeting the problems of unemployment relief of the Nation,

and we do recommend that such additional Federal relief funds as may be necessary and as are appropriated by Congress be made on direct grant basis to the municipalities of the Nation.

FEDERAL COOPERATION A SPUR TO LOCAL AGENCIES

The argument will no doubt be made that a contribution by the Federal Government will lessen the activities of private agencies, local and State governments. This has not been our experience with other Federal-aid legislation. On the contrary, the participation of the Federal Government has without exception in every instance acted as a spur upon the contributions of State and local governments. I need only mention the results in Federal aid for roads, vocational education, eradication of pests, and maternity and infancy care to give but a few of the examples. The experience in the various States that have contributed to the unemployment relief funds likewise demonstrates that action by another governmental unit does not result in the local governments shirking their responsibility. The same argument that is made in the Senate to-day against the pending bill was made in the States against action by the State governments—that is now made against action by the Federal Government; and yet in New York State the opposite result has been demonstrated. I quote from the director of relief in the Empire State, Mr. Hopkins, who was appointed by President-elect Roosevelt:

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have you amplify your statement that the funds provided by the State of New York did not result in any relaxation of activity on the part of cities and counties. Many persons have criticized any action by the Federal Government based on the theory of grants in aid, on the ground that it would cause the cities, counties, and States to wash their hands, so to speak, of the relief problems, throwing it all on the Federal Government.

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, that certainly has not happened in New York. Why it has not happened, I think, is probably due to two reasons. In the first place, when the States come to the assistance of the local community the problem is so acute, it is right on the public officials' necks in the towns and cities; therefore, they do not stand on ceremony and say, "We will not do our share, and if the State does not come in we will not take care of them." They have to take care of them. The second reason, I think, was the policy of the State to say, "We will help you; we will go a long way with you. If you are bankrupt and broke, we will finance the whole business," as we have done. We talked with the public officials and put this relief plan on the ground of a great public service, and we found that the bankers and public citizens in the various cities are more than willing to meet us halfway.

I am convinced that the Federal Government, with half a billions dollars a year, could get a similar amount from the cities, counties, and States throughout this country. I think it is a matter of how the relief funds are administered.

Mr. Stanley P. Davies, associate secretary of the State Charities Aid Association of New York, had this to say on this matter:

In our own experience, the bringing of the State to the aid of the cities and towns in meeting relief did not result in the cities and towns unloading on the State. The offer of the State funds on a reimbursement basis served to get the localities to do things they otherwise would not have done. The result was that the State moneys did not supplant but supplemented the local funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Would or would not a Federal grant in aid be helpful in putting over other bond issues in New York?

Mr. DAVIES. We feel a Federal grant in aid would be helpful in putting over another bond issue; yes. Last fall we had some difficulty in dodging the question as to why New York State did not appeal to the Federal Government for a loan before floating the bond issue. If in floating another bond issue we could say the Federal Government is doing its share, but in order to do our part we must do certain things, I think it would be easier.

Mr. President, I have not the time to cite the numerous case histories which are in the testimony of your committee showing the impact of this frightful situation upon families in the United States formerly self-supporting, self-respecting—families that were the very backbone upon which our civilization rests. I can only appeal to Senators to read that testimony. It dramatizes and gives flesh-and-blood significance to the appalling figures of the low standards of relief which I have submitted for consideration here to-day. A vote for the Wagner substitute will be a vote to continue the degradation of millions of American families in the United States.

Mr. President, we can no longer shirk our responsibility by hiding behind theoretical governmental divisions which are no longer applicable to our modern industrial civiliza-

tion. In the roll call on the Wagner substitute we must answer the question as to whether or not millions of families—men, women, and children—are to be degraded to pauper levels, creating problems of rehabilitation and of social damage on a scale the like of which the world has never experienced before. A vote for the Wagner substitute is a vote to continue the process of pauperization for millions of persons in this country. Three million families, under the existing system, which the Wagner substitute proposes to continue, have already been ground down to this level. Millions more caught in the clutch of circumstances for which they have no responsibility and over which they have no control are rapidly being crushed and degraded.

Mr. President, I choose my words and I weigh them carefully when I say that under the existing standards of relief which the Wagner substitute proposes to perpetuate the fiber of the Nation is being weakened. The family unit, upon which our civilization has been builded, is crumbling and breaking under the strain. These men, these women, these little children—their fate rests in your hands. They have asked for bread. I plead with you not to give them stone.

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES,
December 24, 1932.

DEAR SIR: In the opinion of some of the Members of the Senate, many municipalities are finding it difficult, if not impossible, this winter to continue to meet the mounting burden of unemployment relief, even with the assistance now available to them. To help us in deciding upon proper Federal policy in this emergency, will you let me know at once—

1. What increase there has been in the number of unemployed persons assisted in your city, compared with December, 1931? With December, 1930?

2. How much have the city appropriations for the unemployed increased this year over 1931? Over 1930?

3. In your judgment, how many additional persons will need relief during the winter months?

4. Can your community care for all who will need relief?

5. What proportion of the emergency burden is being carried by private relief agencies? How much have their expenditures increased compared with 1931? With 1930?

6. Can you state the amount of relief given weekly to the average family (two adults and two children)?

7. How are you meeting the problem of the transient unemployed in need of relief?

8. Is your city in a position to float further bond issues in the event that your present income is insufficient to meet adequately the relief needs of the community?

9. Do you anticipate action by your State government to give sufficient assistance to the local communities in meeting unemployment relief this winter?

10. In your judgment, can the unemployment relief problem be adequately met unless the Federal Government makes an outright contribution and cooperates with the State and local governments in meeting this problem?

I shall appreciate any additional information, comment, and suggestions you may care to make.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.

[The material in this report was obtained from answers to a questionnaire sent to mayors of cities. About 1,070 answers have been analyzed.]

Question No. 1. What increase has there been in the number of unemployed persons assisted in your city compared with December, 1931?

Increase to 49 per cent.....	198
50 per cent to 99 per cent.....	161
100 per cent and over.....	225
No change.....	31
Decrease.....	15

Referring to the last item, "decrease," in one or two instances this decrease can be traced to some seasonal occupation which will last for a few weeks.

The decrease can also be traced to the fact that a city has no funds with which to care for the unemployed this year, and hence has taken no census of such persons, and during the year some of the unemployed on last year's list have moved away.

A city may also report "no change" in the number of unemployed when, having no funds with which to care for them, this year's census has not been taken.

Another reason for the report "no change" since 1931 is that in 1931 all the employable persons in a community were out of work; there have, therefore, been none added to the list of unemployed in 1932.

It should be noted, however—and this will be brought out in answer to the next question—that though there is no change or even a decrease in the number of unemployed, it does not follow

that the same amount of money will care for the same number of people this year—savings and all sources of part help having been exhausted.

The following few excerpts from answers to the questionnaire bear on the number of unemployed in various parts of the country:

"Thibodaux, La.: I wish to state that about 75 per cent of our laboring people are demanding relief."

"Gardena, Calif.: The condition of unemployment, particularly among the men registered and known as 'stabilization men' is becoming acute. We have had five men called for work in this section since the 15th of September, 1932, and it would seem that some assistance will have to be given the hungry or the country will be faced with a serious situation."

"El Dorado, Ark.: We have registered throughout the county heads of families seeking employment, up to the close of the day December 29, 4,300. In December, 1931, we had approximately 2,200 unemployed throughout the city and county. In December, 1930, there were comparatively few wholly without jobs. Most of our people at that time were working part-time jobs or jobs of any kind."

"Waukegan, Ill.: From 20 to 25 per cent of population requires help."

"Bettendorf, Iowa: Over a third of population receiving help."

"Eureka, Kans.: Twenty-five per cent of population on relief."

"Dunkirk, N. Y. (population 17,800): Four thousand wage earners out of work."

"Wewoka, Okla.: Has 2 men out of employment for every 1 employed."

"Brackenridge, Pa.: Fifty per cent of population is being aided."

"McAllen, Tex.: Twenty per cent of people in destitute circumstances."

"Ada, Okla.: Seventy-five per cent of wage earners out of employment."

The percentage of increase in unemployment in 1932 over 1930, as reported by 554 cities, is as follows:

To 49 per cent.....	137
50 per cent to 99 per cent.....	132
100 per cent and over.....	285

Question No. 2. How much have the city appropriations for the unemployed increased this year over 1931?

Increase to 99 per cent.....	166
100 per cent and over.....	123
No change.....	39
Unable to make appropriation.....	21
Because of tax delinquencies, no money.....	21
Decrease.....	22

In answering the questionnaire those cities receiving such appropriations from county or State, or from some other source, have in most cases not reported the amounts received.

In general, the last three items could be traced to tax delinquencies. Many letters, in which the amounts received for care of the unemployed are not given, say that there is no money to be had from former sources. It is clear that not only the city treasuries are without funds but that all sources from which this help has been coming in a great many cases are dry.

Following are a few excerpts bearing out this fact—that tax delinquencies are responsible for the lack of appropriation in many localities:

"Ladysmith, Wis.: Due to delinquent taxes, the county has no cash and 40 per cent of the city taxes are delinquent (1932), and even with a decrease in valuation from \$4,000,000 to \$2,500,000, we will likely have 50 per cent delinquent tax for 1933, for factories have not operated and people must have work to pay taxes."

"Beaver Dam, Wis.: Had 512 property holders who could not pay their taxes for 1932, and from present indications may have over 1,000 delinquents for 1933."

"Smithville, Tex.: Our city is in worse shape financially than it was in 1930; taxes are remaining unpaid, and we have not been able to so arrange our budget so that current bills can be paid, * * * neither can we take care of the resident unemployed."

"Hays, Kans.: This city is in debt now \$655,000 and the taxes are not being paid."

"Battle Creek, Mich.: We asked last August for \$2 per \$1,000 on a tax valuation of \$62,000,000 for poor relief, but on account of a large delinquency we are about 20 per cent short of the amount asked."

Even though many cities report an increase in appropriation for care of the unemployed, making the amount available for relief two or three times what it was last year, these same cities report that they will be unable to care for those who will need relief in their communities this winter and the rest of the year. In spite of the fact that the increase in appropriation is larger than the percentage of increase in the number of unemployed, this is still true. Last year there were many receiving only partial relief—they had a little money in bank, or were perhaps being helped by relatives and friends. Banks have closed and these other sources of help are depleted, and they are now compelled to ask for full relief.

The following excerpts bear on this:

"Conneaut, Ohio: Requests for relief in our city are increasing at a rapid rate, due not so much to increased unemployment but rather to the fact that our people have used up all their resources, including bank accounts and canceled insurance policies."

"Orange, Mass.: We anticipate that many families have been living on their savings, which have become exhausted, and in a very short time they will have to be added to the welfare list."

"Pecos, Tex.: The unemployment in our community is not greatly increasing, but need for relief has been, because of the fact that numbers of our people have exhausted all their resources, on which they have been enabled to maintain themselves until now."

"Taylor, Pa.: Our only bank closed June, 1932, and those who could help and were willing to help are now penniless."

A few of the answers refer to the money received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Following are a few excerpts concerning this:

"Del Rio, Tex.: Under the present program of work relief, as administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, we are not receiving sufficient funds to adequately care for all of our unemployed."

"Berkley, Mich.: In my judgment, the unemployment relief problem is being met, though rather inadequately, through loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

"Key West, Fla.: The amount of relief being given weekly to the unemployed families by the unemployment relief fund received from the State through the Federal agencies amounts to \$2 per month for families of 2, \$4 per month for families of 3 or 4, and \$6 for families of 5 to 13."

"El Dorado, Ark.: We are endeavoring to give a family * * * two days' work each week for \$1.50. * * * The fund we have received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to this time is not sufficient for us to give more work."

"Denver, Colo.: We have been told by the agent of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that none of this money can be used for administration and, also, that it may be used only for food, fuel, and clothing. This does not meet the problem of rent, cash allowances, transportation, etc. The procedure for handling this is cumbersome and inadequate."

"Raymond, Wash.: The special provisions of the emergency construction highway projects or the emergency relief and construction act of July 21, 1932, has not helped us, though we have several projects under way here. The contractors have too many loopholes through which they may hire their labor from the outside, yet we have plenty of experienced and common laborers in our community who are willing workers and must have work or be given charity."

"Seattle, Wash.: The present Reconstruction Finance Corporation regulations concerning public works limiting Federal aid to self-liquidating projects makes it doubtful if the State of Washington can take advantage of this type of Federal aid to any large extent in the near future."

A few cities in speaking of a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan suggest that it may be difficult to repay the loan.

Question No. 3. In your judgment, how many additional persons will need relief during the winter months?

Question No. 4. Can your community care for all who will need relief?

Seven hundred and three cities report that they will have an additional burden of persons needing relief, without definitely specifying the number.

Four hundred and ninety-seven state definitely that they will be unable to care for all who will need relief.

Seventy-nine can not care for those who will need relief without help.

Eighty-nine are doubtful as to whether they will be able to care for them.

Twenty say they can do this after a fashion, but not properly. Two hundred and forty-six say that they can care for those who will need help.

In the latter category, of course, are many counting on aid from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Of the above number answering the fourth question, 931, it may safely be said that 685 cities will not be able to care for all those who will need aid this winter.

That this large percentage of cities unable to care for those in need is typical of the condition of cities all over the country is borne out by the excerpts attached to this report.

In connection with the assertion of some cities that they can care for all who will need relief, it would be interesting to know what they consider adequate relief. Many of those saying that it will be possible to care for all are paying a weekly allowance to a family of four which is a good deal less than the average of \$4.25.

Question No. 5. (a) What proportion of the emergency burden is being carried by private relief agencies?—

Up to 49 per cent of the burden.....	321
50 per cent to 99 per cent.....	169
100 per cent.....	71
None.....	112
Small proportion.....	71
Large proportion.....	9

(b) How much have their expenditures increased compared with 1931? With 1930?

Up to 49 per cent.....	141
50 per cent to 99 per cent.....	87
100 per cent and over.....	124
Decrease.....	64
No increase.....	40
Small increase.....	13
Large increase.....	3
None of burden carried.....	68

1930

Up to 49 per cent.....	131
50 per cent to 99 per cent.....	82
100 per cent and over.....	112
Decrease.....	38
No increase.....	19
Small increase.....	4
No burden carried.....	23

Even with the increase of expenditure by private agencies, this relief is quite apparently not sufficient. With the augmented need for help over last year, in many cases funds are already exhausted, with no prospect of collecting a sufficient amount to cope with the situation. In many cases it will be impossible to collect any more at all from private sources.

The following excerpts from answers to the questionnaire bear this fact out:

"The family welfare bureau and the community chest are very active and are doing a great work, but finances are so limited that they can not take care of the situation." (Prichard, Ala.)

"In regard to private relief agencies, every effort is being made to bolster them up, but they are practically swamped." (Redondo Beach, Calif.)

"Private relief agencies are taking care of many, but the drain on these has increased to such a point that their funds are getting low." (Walsenburg, Colo.)

"The emergency committee has closed due to lack of funds." (Augusta, Ga.)

"A small percentage of the burden of relief is being cared for by private charity. * * * During the winter of 1931-32 there was collected approximately \$4,000. Six hundred dollars of this amount was lost in closed banks." (Twin Falls, Idaho.)

"In view of the fact that the income of the majority of our citizens who are still employed as industrial workers has been reduced from 30 to 75 per cent, it is therefore impossible to consider any program of private subscriptions for relief." (Waukegan, Ill.)

"The Red Cross has done a great deal in relieving hardship, but now their activities are greatly curtailed because of inability to raise funds." (Clinton, Ind.)

"Community relief has heretofore been furnished by voluntary subscription. In the fall of 1932 these funds ran out." (Cumberland, Md.)

"Our funds so far have been raised by private subscriptions, but they are already exhausted and we are throwing up our hands." (Fredericktown, Mo.)

"This community has heretofore cared for those who needed relief by popular subscriptions, * * * but this means of raising money is being exhausted." (Glendive, Mont.)

"There is very little relief from private agencies, as our residents are not in a position to aid—most of them are only existing." (Ridgefield, N. J.)

"Town people are at end of their resources to aid." (Alamogordo, N. Mex.)

"We have vastly increased our local charities to help feed and clothe the unemployed, but now, as this has been going on for three years or more, we have about exhausted these resources and many of those who helped charity in 1930 are now asking for charity and help for themselves." (Edenton, N. C.)

"All of our private relief funds are depleted and no way to raise any more." (Cordell, Okla.)

"Voluntary relief has become very nearly exhausted and we are almost wholly dependent upon State aid now. This is due to the fact that the number of private contributors has grown less and the number needing aid has grown larger." (Ford City, Pa.)

"The treasuries of all private relief agencies in this State are practically depleted." (Central Falls, R. I.)

"All relief is from private subscriptions, which are about exhausted." (Lebanon, Tenn.)

"Various private relief organizations * * * have for some time past made considerable expenditures for the purpose of meeting the terrific unemployment situation and resultant misery prevalent in this community. The officials * * * or at least most of them, report well-nigh complete exhaustion of their relief funds, with little or no possibility of further adequate contributions for relief purposes." (Antigo, Wis.)

"All private agencies exhausted." (Benwood, W. Va.)

Question No. 6: Can you state the amount of relief given weekly to the average family (two adults and two children)?

Of the 873 cities answering the question, the aggregate of their weekly allowances to a family of four amounted to \$3,728.77—giving an average of \$4.25.

In many cases this allowance is in a grocery order. Sometimes it is given in return for work, paid for at rates varying from 75 cents to as high as \$2.50 a day.

To this amount there should be added, often, old clothes, medical attention, sometimes rent and fuel, etc.

On the other hand, in many cases less than \$4.25 is the total amount of relief given to a family of four.

Question No. 7. How are you meeting the problem of the transient unemployed in need of relief?

One hundred and seven cities report that they are not meeting it at all.

Fifty-eight give work relief.

One hundred and ninety-five report a small amount of temporary relief.

Ninety-one give a meal or two or some other temporary relief and order the transient to move on.

Thirty-five do nothing but order the transient to move on. Forty-two endeavor to provide transportation to the next city, to home, or place of destination.

Six report that they give aid to the transient and charge the expenses back to his legal place of residence (one city reports that all but 5 per cent of money spent in this way has been collected).

One hundred and forty-eight report the problem cared for by the Salvation Army, Red Cross, or some similar agency.

Eighty-nine report that the problem is a small one with them. Sixty-nine report that they have no such problem at all.

The tenor of practically all the answers to this question is to the effect that the transient is helped just as little as possible and then sent on his way. In two or three places some provision in the way of work camps or shelters has been made.

Those cities reporting work relief, a small amount of temporary relief, and help by the Salvation Army, or similar agency, usually give a meal or two, perhaps a night's shelter (occasionally two nights), and in some cases, though rarely, a little gas.

A strong effort is made everywhere to get rid of these transient unemployed just as soon as is possible, for, as some of the cities state, they can not even take care of their own unemployed.

Attached are excerpts from over 600 cities reporting on this question.

Question No. 8. Is your city in a position to float further bond issues in the event that your present income is insufficient to meet adequately the relief needs of the community?

Seven hundred cities report that they are not in such a position.

Twenty-nine are doubtful as to their ability in this regard. Five state that they can not float bonds to any great amount.

Two hundred state that they can float bonds for such a purpose.

Six say that they do not need to float them for this purpose.

Many of the 200 stating that they are in a position to float further bond issues—or that they may for such a purpose—state that even though they would be permitted to do so, that it would be difficult to get an affirmative vote for this, and, moreover, that there would be practically no market for them.

Question No. 9. Do you anticipate action by your State government to give sufficient assistance to the local communities in meeting unemployment relief this winter?

Four hundred and thirty-four cities do not expect such assistance.

Eighty-six are doubtful as to receiving it. Thirty-eight think they may receive some, but not adequate, assistance.

Two hundred and seventy-three do expect sufficient assistance from the State government.

Thirteen expect the assistance through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Under the answers to question No. 2 will be found excerpts from letters which speak of the manner in which Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds are being handled, etc. One city speaks of the length of time it takes to obtain such funds—so long that they can not serve the purpose for which they were intended.

Question No. 10. In your judgment can the unemployment relief problem be adequately met unless the Federal Government makes an outright contribution and cooperates with the State and local governments in meeting this problem?

Aggregate population

616 answer "no".....	24,342,455
35 are doubtful as to the answer.....	549,893
7 want Federal help, but not outright contribution.....	78,771
5 think the Federal Government should cooperate.....	88,003
11 state that the State or Federal Government must help.....	130,438
3 must have the cooperation of the State.....	30,858
6 can get along temporarily without such help.....	57,412
5 do not approve of aid by Federal Government.....	75,469
202 can get along without a Federal contribution.....	2,009,575
8 can get along with Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds.....	115,489

Following are some excerpts which bear on this question:

"The Federal Government has an obligation to contribute directly and to act at once to bring material assistance to State and local governments." (Tulsa, Okla.)

"It will be impossible to meet the unemployment relief problems unless we receive the aid of the Federal Government and State cooperation. The survey made by the city-relief committee for the necessary money needed for 1933 estimate that this county will be short \$1,750,000." (Alliance, Ohio.)

"The winter is almost over here and if State aid does not come in 60 days it will be no help. At present there is nothing being done in our State legislature to relieve our unemployed. We feel here that if the Federal Government does not do something for the unemployed situation soon that we may have trouble. Relief agencies have just about used all their resources and the towns and counties can not help much longer, so something must be done very soon to relieve those who are in need." (Coalinga, Calif.)

"Unless we have immediate relief from Government sources we will all be asking for help." (Nogales, Ariz.)

"I do not believe the unemployment relief problem can be adequately met without contribution from the Federal Government and cooperation with the State and local governments. The reason

I say 'outright contributions,' particularly with local and city governments, is that there are a good many cities incorporated under the State law which provides that loans can not be made excepting upon a vote of the people." (San Fernando, Calif.)

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, as indicated by the Senator from Wisconsin in his powerful and moving address, on the final vote to be taken this afternoon there will be one, and only one, real issue. It is whether America chooses to help our millions of blameless victims of unemployment through scientific and carefully supervised grants to the States, guided by expert and humane men and women, as proposed in the Senate bill before us, or whether Federal aid is to continue, as provided in the pending Wagner substitute, in the form of unsatisfactory loans to States and cities. The controversy over this question and the insistence on loans are alike extraordinary. For many months similar loans have not saved us from poorly administered, unstandardized, and, for the most part, cruelly inadequate relief.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in what respect the Costigan-La Follette bill sets up any different standard for distribution of funds, what complaints States have made that they were denied the funds applied for? I am mystified at the particular kind of criticism the Senator is making of my substitute.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, I trust that my analysis will prove clear. If not, after I have concluded there should be an opportunity to answer the Senator in detail. There is no disposition to avoid his question, but, as the Senator is aware, the allotted time is limited, and it appears best to complete my affirmative statement first.

Let no one be deceived. America has not been taking care of countless numbers of our fellow citizens, who are wretched sufferers from our four winters of economic collapse; and under the Wagner substitute we are asked to proceed further along the same relief path of miserable failure we have been traveling. The Senator from New York, whose name is identified with admirable efforts to improve industrial conditions, will hardly defend his substitute, except on the ground that it is the best he can secure from this Congress and our present President. He is thoroughly aware of failures of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the relief field. He discussed them in the Senate last December. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has given us no assurances that it will do its relief task better if given further funds, and the loan provisions of the law hamper it in that respect if it were so disposed. Indeed, many of us have been until this moment hoping against hope that the Senator from New York would join our demand for better, wiser, more humane legislation, represented by the pending bill, which the Senator from New York has declared he is willing to support if his substitute is defeated.

It is absurd to challenge the intelligence of the Senate on this subject. The Senate is informed. It knows what it is doing, and nothing is more certain than that the substitute should be defeated. The precise question before us of properly administered relief was voted on here a year ago after prolonged discussion. It was left undecided in February, 1932. It was revived in the following July in the unfortunate, inferior, and compromise loan form, which is before us again to-day. Thinking men and women condemned the loan provisions then, as ever since, and are unyieldingly opposed to perpetuating them through the pending substitute of the Senator from New York. In enacting that legislation we turned our humanitarian task into the hands of bankers, who were acting as loan makers usually do at an hour when the public interest demanded instant and adequate relief. To-day, therefore, we are once more here, fortified again by irrefutable and heart-breaking evidence and by expert judgment, pleading not emotionally but under the stern dictation of facts for a finer, sounder, and juster treatment of stricken men, women, and children. So grave and fundamental are the issues that they should stir all of us, who value our country's traditions and possibilities, to immediate and more adequate remedial efforts.

Turning to the problems raised by unemployment, and dealt with in the pending bill, I think it perhaps best to

summarize at the outset certain conclusions, before reviewing as concisely as limited time permits, certain parts of the supporting evidence. The course is simplified because it is no longer necessary to cover the entire field. It is my task to supplement what has already been outlined by the Senator from Wisconsin to clear the way for an early and decisive vote.

The following are some of the main conclusions on the pending bill and the relief situation which are supported by the testimony of undisputed and expert witnesses:

First. Unemployment in the United States has increased by leaps and bounds since the stock market collapse of 1929 until conservative figures of the totally unemployed now reach approximately twelve million men and women, twice the number idle a year ago, which itself represented a great increase over the preceding year. Far-reaching part-time unemployment has intensified the resulting misery and unrest. The distress—like the causes from which it springs—is nation-wide, and the persistence and growth of the problem have shocked and alarmed those most familiar with ordinary unemployment.

Second. The human toll exacted by present conditions is indescribable. Because of lost earnings families have been and are being scattered, and individual members left undernourished, with their happiness destroyed. An army of unemployed, unwelcome and uncared for, is wandering up and down the highways and by-ways of our country. Yet local relief for known neighbors, without provision for strangers, is our traditional and expected practice. Child life has been infinitely impoverished and saddened. Mental depression, malnutrition, illness, semistarvation, starvation itself—at times concealed behind fatal disease and collapse—are torturing those who are not in any wise at fault.

Third. During our continuing crisis, which has all the human aspects of a major disaster, like earthquake, flood, or fire—prolonged through years—inadequacy has naturally resulted in private and public efforts to cope with the emergency. The proportionate decline of generous charitable contributions has necessitated increasing dependence on public grants, local, State, and Federal. To-day public funds constitute 90 per cent of human relief now being granted, in place of 70 per cent little more than a year ago. The part played by community chests, the Red Cross, and other volunteer agencies is a diminishing fraction of the total picture.

Fourth. The breakdown of private resources has been widely accompanied by inability of local governmental agencies to meet present need. The appeal for relief, long ago passed city halls and State capitols and brought its imperative and unavoidable summons to Washington. The national aspects of the tragedy are both certain and urgent. No local community in fairness can be asked to assume an undue part of our national burden. Transients wandering over America by hundreds of thousands; homeless men, women, boys, and girls adrift; American citizens in general, in dire need and on the verge of extreme and growing want, can not be safely disregarded by a country, grounded in principles which recognize the dignity of the human soul and the fundamental importance of all men's right to life, liberty, and happiness.

Fifth. The compromise relief measure, adopted by Congress last July as an amendment to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, has been administered—in part because its provisions appear so to require—from the viewpoint of bankers rather than humanitarian organization and efficiency. Doubtless the best evidence of that fact is that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] one of the authors of that imperfect measure, has with fine frankness declared his present conviction—which the friends of the pending bill foresaw a year ago—that the relief features of the law should be removed from that corporation's control, and placed in independent and expert hands. Nor should we longer be told that the loan provisions of the act of 1932 are in any way sacred, since the Senator from New York has at last joined us in urging that, at least in the case of transients, provision should now be made for

relief by the Federal Government in the form of outright grants to the States.

The abandonment by the Senator from New York of certain provisions of the law he favored last year is entirely justified. Having parted company with Reconstruction Finance Corporation management, our hope has been that he may now take a further step and support the informed judgment of those most expert in this field in advocating the repeal of the loan features of the act of 1932 and the substitution of outright relief grants to the States by the Federal Government, to be matched as far as possible, by States, but in case of unmet necessity to be extended, whether matched or not, as provided in the pending bill of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and myself. When authorizing these grants to the States, Congress should also authorize such cooperation between the Federal board and the States as will guard the wise expenditure of the funds through competent persons, and will assure economical and humane relief for those who must be assisted.

Sixth. In other respects the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is fundamentally unsuited to grapple with our immediate relief problem. The loan provisions of the present relief law have kept various States from applying for Federal funds, notwithstanding the existence of widespread suffering, and at least semistarvation, within their borders. In addition, some cities, like Detroit, in States which, at least for a time, failed to apply for Federal loans have been obliged to offer their securities as collateral in such amounts as to strain, and in a measure destroy, municipal credit, and thereby weaken the credit of municipalities generally. Furthermore the relief extended by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has usually been fed out in short-time advances, preventing long-time planning, and arousing such anxiety and fear among those dependent on help that demonstrations threatening public violence have followed. Even worse, the aid provided by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been so meager and has varied so radically in different places, that the sense of security, which has been encouraged in the public mind, is without foundation.

Seventh. Separate provisions are necessary in our relief laws for special attention to the needs of transient and migratory boys and men. This subject is appropriately treated in the bills of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], both of which look to Federal supervision of civilian camps in which wholesome activities and rehabilitation may be given sound direction. The provisions of these two bills have been substantially incorporated in the pending bill. It should further be noted that the pending measure plans to use an independent and expert supervisory board, not incorporated in the substitute of the Senator from New York, and to resort to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation merely as the source of the necessary funds to be authorized. The pending bill for these reasons may be considered a combination of the most desirable features of the various legislative relief proposals of Senators CUTTING, WAGNER, LA FOLLETTE, and myself.

Eighth. The grants required for anything approaching proper relief, if supplemented as planned by equal amounts raised from local, State, and other sources, will exceed the amounts heretofore appropriated or otherwise provided except in the pending bill. While the bill sponsored by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and myself calls for substantial Federal funds to prevent starvation and relieve semistarvation, America must recognize that, compared with war costs, the amount is small, and that our Nation is at this hour in the midst of a war on depression which it is our duty to wage ceaselessly along the whole economic front.

Turning to the actual testimony, let us look first at the evidence before the Committee on Manufactures on the extent of unemployment in the United States and related human needs.

Doctor Billikopf, the efficient and humane executive director of Foundation for Jewish Charities in Philadelphia,

gave the following figures showing the growth of unemployment:

1930	4,860,000
1931	5,600,000
October, 1932	12,000,000

President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, pointed out that the federation on January 7, 1933, estimated total unemployment in the United States at 11,590,000, a figure which has since been increased by the federation, according to press reports, to 12,000,000.

Donald Richberg, the noted general counsel of the Railway Labor Executives Association, stated that in 1923 the number of railroad workers in the United States was 1,900,000, and that their positions had been lost in the following tragic numbers: In 1923-1929, 200,000; in 1930-31, 550,000; in 1932, 100,000; a total of 850,000, leaving but 1,050,000 still employed, and representing a final loss to date of from 45 to 47 per cent.

These and other prominent and qualified experts further testified as follows:

Mr. Hopkins, administrator of New York State emergency relief, said that 250,000 families out of about 1,000,000 families without income in New York State, were receiving relief in January, 1933. He predicted that the number needing aid will be increased to more than 300,000 families during the present year. Mr. Hopkins further testified that in the Nation 3,000,000 families will require relief this year.

Mr. Bane, director of the American Association of Public Welfare, testified that the number of families in New York receiving relief last July was 100,000.

Mr. West, executive secretary of the American Association of Social Workers, estimated the families now being helped in the United States at from 3,000,000 to 3,500,000. He added that 459,483 families, under the figures of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, needing help are not receiving it, and wholly disagreed, therefore, with the testimony of Mr. Croxton that no persons have gone hungry. He further called attention to Mr. Hodson's testimony that 30,000 families are in need of relief in New York, and are not receiving it.

Mr. Estill, director of public welfare for West Virginia, reported that in Kanawha County, W. Va., alone, out of 9,600 applications for relief, only 6,000 were granted, and that there was not sufficient help to investigate the others. He added that medical care had been abandoned in that county.

Mrs. Tyson, representing the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare, testified that about 2,000,000 persons are unemployed in Pennsylvania at this time. A year ago last summer the total for Pennsylvania was estimated at about 1,100,000.

Mr. Lurie, New York, director of social research work, testified that in 43 cities relief is being given to 3,000,000 persons, 650,000 families, and 100,000 homeless individuals.

Mr. Goldsmith, Chicago, director of Jewish charities, states that in Chicago 800,000 to 850,000 are out of work, representing two-fifths (40 per cent) of the total employable. He further stated that in Illinois 10 per cent are receiving help of 40 per cent out of work. He gave the following figures of unemployment in Illinois:

1930	265,123
January, 1931	756,739
October, 1932	1,049,000
January, 1933	1,400,000

Doctor Billikopf quoted the New York Times as having pointed out that the estimated unemployed in Detroit early this year was 350,000 out of potential wage workers numbering 689,000, and that the total number of families dependent on charity for food, clothing, and shelter in Detroit increased from July 1 to December 1, 1932, from 23,341 to 32,640 families, or about 100,000 individuals.

Doctor Goldstein, of New York, read into his testimony reports from the four great industrial States, Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York. For Illinois he quoted Mr. Carl Borders, general secretary of the Illinois League for

Industrial Democracy, who confirmed the above figures of about 1,400,000 unemployed, representing two-fifths of the number normally employed. The statement added that practically all relief funds since February, 1932, had been from State and Federal sources; \$20,000,000 Federal and \$19,000,000 State, and that relief standards are below normal.

A report from Doctor Rubinow, who has been associated with the State unemployment-insurance commission, was to the effect that the unemployed in Ohio are more than 30 per cent, with a pay-roll shrinkage from nearly \$2,000,000,000 to less than half since 1929. The State was reported in a well-nigh desperate position with from 400,000 to 500,000 in the State, out of a population of 7,000,000, supported from private and public relief funds. The annual relief budget of \$20,000,000 represents, according to this report, only a drop in the bucket in comparison with wage losses.

Mr. Rieve, president of the American Federation of Full Fashioned Hosiery Workers, reported for Philadelphia that the unemployed are estimated to exceed 1,200,000 which is over 34 per cent of the total working population of Pennsylvania. The State relief fund of \$2,000,000 permits probably about \$1.50 to \$2 a week to families needing aid. In Philadelphia the number of families receiving relief is reported between 50,000 and 60,000.

In New York State Doctor Goldstein reports that unemployment has increased within the last year from 25 to 30 per cent and that in some industrial centers 50 to 60 per cent of the workers are out of work all the time. In the State as a whole 1,500,000 men and women are reported wholly without work. This does not include men and women who are working part time and losing from two to four days a week. He estimates that the State-wide need will require at least \$144,000,000 this coming year if each family in need is allowed \$10 per week. On this basis New York will need Federal aid to the extent of \$84,000,000 "if the unemployed are to be saved from further destitution and collapse."

Confirming in substance other testimony about Pennsylvania, Mrs. Helen Tyson, of the State department of welfare at Harrisburg, gave the following figures on unemployment in Pennsylvania:

April, 1930, United States Census.....	325,402
November, 1932.....	1,099,841
May, 1932, estimated Pennsylvania families on relief.....	250,000
December, 1932, estimated Pennsylvania families on relief.....	397,279

with monthly additions to relief of 40,000 to 50,000 families. In the State as a whole 30 per cent of the workers were said to be unemployed.

In 12 counties in southwestern Pennsylvania, according to Mrs. Tyson, 143,000 families, or about 700,000 individuals, were on relief in December, 1932, not including thousands of workers "who have one day's work in two weeks or one day a week—far below the minimum standard of living."

Mrs. Tyson further stated—

that in the near future there is every probability that half a million families, or 2,000,000 individuals, will be receiving relief from public funds in Pennsylvania.

She added:

Nowhere in the State to-day is relief adequate. The usual weekly family grant for food in December was between \$2 and \$4. The maximum grant is \$4.50. In Pittsburgh 90 cents a week for individuals is given. It is evident that this amount can hardly keep body and soul together.

Mrs. Tyson spoke of this as "prolonged semistarvation."

Let us turn next to the relief amounts expended.

Mr. Hodson gave the following figures for amounts spent by private agencies:

1930.....	\$5,285,000
1931.....	15,378,000
1932.....	18,880,000

Mr. Hopkins reported that New York State since November 1, 1931, has appropriated \$55,000,000 for relief. He added that at the time of his testimony—January, 1933—\$37,000,000 had been spent of State money and the balance is being

appropriated at \$4,000,000 a month; also that the total monthly expenditures for direct relief in the State now amount to \$8,000,000 a month and should be \$10,000,000 a month in 1933.

Mr. Lurie testified that in 43 cities of the United States \$17,500,000 a month are being spent.

Miss Ward, general secretary of the Family Welfare Association of Baltimore, added that in Baltimore \$1 per week is being given per family in need.

Mr. West pointed out that in the month of November the old-age pension average was \$25.97 in most cases for a single person; that \$20.57 is the unemployment relief average for a whole family, taking all sizes; that in many cases the limit of relief being granted is \$3 to \$5 a week, or less; and that in one Southwestern State the regular scale of relief is \$5 per month or \$60 per year.

Doctor Winslow of the Federal Children's Bureau, testified that in cities of 50,000 or more in January, 1931, about \$14,000,000 was spent for relief and the highest amount expended was \$29,000,000 at the peak point in March, 1932. During October, 1932, it was about \$24,000,000. The drop in July was caused to a considerable extent by the discontinuance of relief work in Philadelphia, to which I shall refer in a moment.

Questioned about Mr. Croxton's statement, indicating that under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation "no persons have gone hungry if they have made applications in the 36 States covered by the corporation's loans," Mr. West declared his disagreement, and pointed out that Mr. Croxton's own figures showed a very large number reported in need and not receiving relief. He added that Mr. Hodson had expressed the opinion that approximately 30,000 families in need of relief are not being cared for in New York territory nor being assisted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Mr. West further said that reports had reached the American Association of Social Workers, with which he is connected, that in many cities families in need are not being provided aid. He gave the following table listing some examples of that sort:

	Families or individuals
San Francisco, Calif.....	16,000
Denver, Colo.....	3,000
Washington, D. C.....	2,000
Lawrence, Mass.....	800-1,200
Dallas County, Tex.....	20,000
Houston, Tex.....	3,000
Kanawha County, W. Va.....	2,000
Ohio County, W. Va.....	1,500
Orleans Parish, La.....	4,000
Waterbury, Conn.....	337

I turn, because of the brevity of time, from a further summary of the testimony I had hoped to present to the subject of the effects of unemployment and inadequate relief.

Mr. Van A. Bittner, representing the United Mine Workers of America, after testifying about conditions in West Virginia, said, "Senator, God only knows how these people get along."

Taking Harrison County as a fair example of coal mining regions, he stated that 25,459 people out of 78,567 in the county are receiving some relief. Of 6,500 coal miners in that county less than 1,600 are employed leaving more than 4,900 unemployed. About 3,500 men are employed each week at \$2.40 per 8-hour day, 20 per cent of this being paid in cash, the men working approximately five days a month.

He further stated:

I have known hundreds of families in the last three months and prior to that time but, since the Government flour has been distributed, that have not a thing to eat three times a day—or whenever they do eat—but just this flour and water baked up as best they can.

Mr. West testified that we used to boast of our standards of living; that we have made people afraid of relief; that we have been guided by fear that people would lean too heavily on relief agencies, and, as a result—

We have blindly put millions of people through terrible experiences * * * because we have not been willing to grant relief adequately.

He discussed the way in which we have let families lose all their resources, followed that with references to low amounts of food relief, and discussed the loss in capacity which will follow the crushing out of every hope, faith, and opportunity.

Doctor De Schweinitz stated that in England and Germany a man out of work knows he will at least receive shelter, food, and clothing though he is not helped so as to make him want to live without work. He added:

There is a kind of security existing abroad, which is absent in the United States. * * * If a man has a job, the United States is the best place in the world to live, but if you have not a job you are better off almost anywhere else. In the United States we need to provide a minimum of adequacy, that is at least shelter, food, and clothing. * * *

One of the great values that I see in Federal aid is to make it possible for many families, or those individuals requiring help, to receive it wherever he happens to be at the time.

Mr. Lurie, speaking of the effects of unemployment, said:

Homes are lost, insurance policies canceled, aid from relatives and friends has been terminated, families are forced to exhaust and destroy indefinitely their credit before relief is granted to them. This statement on the degree of destitution reached before relief is granted is applicable in practically all communities. A number of cities report that no work or home relief is being made available to adult families—that is, to childless couples or families without young children. No relief or very inadequate forms of relief are being given to the unattached men and women without family connections.

He added many other distressing details.

Attention has already been directed to the testimony of Mr. Estill, director of public welfare in West Virginia, showing 3,600 applications for relief in one county, the merits of which welfare workers were too busy to investigate. As was also stated by him, in using Federal funds medical care had to be abandoned because of a regulation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which in the grants made for the year 1932 adopted a resolution to the effect that the funds were not to be available for medical, hospital, or institutional services.

Mrs. Tyson, giving a picture of the idle unemployed in Pennsylvania, said in part:

Large groups of the unemployed stand around listlessly. There is great need for clothing, particularly men's and boys'. * * * The Catholic priest said that the men had been half starved for so long that they have no spirit left.

Asked how the men passed their time, the answer was that they spent it wondering if the steel mill will reopen. Mrs. Tyson added: "There is no prospect of the mill being opened."

Though most of the testimony was tragic, perhaps its most stirring feature related to the effects of unemployment on children. Information on this subject crept into the record from time to time.

Doctor Billikopf referred to a book by Ernest Poole, quoting Mary Breckenridge, organizer and director of the Frontier Nursing Service, as speaking of numberless deaths from tuberculosis in the mountains of Kentucky, and saying:

Hundreds of children are stricken and so little can be done for them in their crowded, drafty homes. So they grow worse and soon infect others in the family. I remember a little boy of 10 who had tuberculosis, and whose two brothers had died of it. He came to Wendover one day, and at the end of his visit he said:

"Well, now I'm going home to die. Everybody in our house dies."

Doctor McCormack, secretary of the Kentucky State Board of Health, is also quoted as having said recently, as reported by the New York Times:

At the State health officers' conference at Lexington a few days ago the distressing intelligence was developed that in 40 per cent of the deaths in 18 rural counties the patients had not been visited by a physician, due to the fact that the people are without money.

On the subject of eye trouble Doctor Billikopf testified as follows:

Doctor McCormack cited three cases of xerophthalmia, a very rare ailment, caused by lack of vitamin A in the food con-

sumed, and which is characterized by a drying up of the eyeballs. This disease afflicted Poland during the World War.

I might say that in 1920, when I visited Poland and other contiguous countries, I came across this disease known as xerophthalmia, and in Germany, as Hungerkrankheit, a disease which results in continuous blinking, due to lack of food, and subsequent blindness. I saw hundreds of such victims, and I say to you that of all the devastating impressions made on me on my visit shortly following the war, nothing compared with the sight of children afflicted with this dreadful disease. I thought we were immune in this country, but here comes Doctor McCormack citing specific instances of xerophthalmia, found in Kentucky and possibly elsewhere.

Doctor Goldstein testified in part that the department of health of the city of New York makes periodic examinations of children in the public schools of that city, and that the commissioner of health reported recently that 33 1/3 per cent more children were suffering from undernourishment than 12 months ago. He added that there is a breakdown in family life, that families are forced to move into tenements declared insanitary and uninhabitable 25 years ago; that families are herded into such small space that they suffer dangers to health and moral life; also that there is a marked increase in insanity and suicides because men and women are unable to stand the strain of unemployment and constant suffering.

Mr. Carstens, director of the Child Welfare League of America, having about 150 member organizations, declared in part that in January, 1932, there had been an increase over 1931 of about 39 per cent in the number of children taken from their homes and placed in foster homes, agencies, or institutions, public and private; that since January, 1932, the increase has been only about 5 per cent, which some people would conclude means returning good times. He adds that instead, the explanation of the diminished percentage is due to the exhaustion of resources of the receiving agencies.

Nine agencies had stopped receiving children, 57 of 62 agencies reported they had actually turned down about 1,700 children, and the number was doubtless larger. He added, with reference to 75,000 children, that 71 of 145 different organizations had had to curtail their services to children, not giving good medical or dental services or the children's allowances of 5 or 10 cents a week. He stated that dependent, neglected, and early delinquent children, if not properly cared for, may later become delinquents or criminals; also that 1,978 children were reported held in care ready to go out into the world but with no work to go to. Discussing the care of 350,000 children, he said:

Thousands of children are being refused care—I refer now specifically to the 1,700 that were reported, but the total number must be considered considerably larger—because neither the private nor public agencies are in a position to give them care.

Speaking of transient children, he added that the number is variously estimated from 200,000 up to a million—no one, he believed, knowing the number—and added that he thought care for the transient groups is an obligation for the Federal Government—

Because I do not think it is going to be naturally assumed by the local community. Our committee is helping. However, that is a drop in the bucket, of course. * * * It is not merely a matter of caring for them overnight; they must have something in the way of education and recreation that will hold them in the community and keep them from further drifting.

Miss Edith Abbott, dean of the School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, testified in part that in Franklin County, Ill., she has been told there are hundreds of children who have not had a balanced meal for years; that when the funds for mothers' pensions were cut off in 1930, mothers and children were left without this sole means of support, and the relief given has been inadequate. She gave many other instances of the unfortunate effects of limited relief on child health and welfare. She quoted letters stating that many children are suffering from lack of proper nourishment in Chicago; and that 240 children in one school examined by a doctor were declared clearly cases of malnutrition anæmia.

She added that under the pending bill, in her judgment, sound social standards would be better preserved than under the provisions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act.

Mr. Pickett, secretary of the American Friends Service Committee, who has done devoted and effective work for the American Friends testified about relief given in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Illinois. He stated that his organization was feeding in January in 16 counties in West Virginia and Kentucky about 11,000 or 12,000 children and that the figures have been climbing rapidly; that the proportion of children fed this year in the schools is 51 per cent, compared with 35 per cent last year; that shoes are more scarce this year than last and that funds have been set aside to purchase shoes for the children only. He said:

In Kentucky, just before I came away, I received notice that three schools have had to close because of the presence of trachoma. * * * I understand it is augmented by malnutrition. It is not necessarily a malnutrition disease. There is another disease which has been turned up by the State department of health which causes a disturbance in the eyes, which makes the child completely blind. * * * Within three weeks, in Kentucky, by putting some of the children on a butter diet, sight has been restored.

He added that the grants in Kentucky from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were entirely inadequate, the first grants ranging as low as \$1 a family per month. He testified that the newer grants had been not nearly adequate, being approximately \$1 per week per family. He further stated that conditions are worse this year than last so far as children are concerned.

Miss Ward reported that in Johns Hopkins Hospital a study of the admissions in 1928-29 compared with 1931-32 showed that the causes for admission had changed and that mental depression is an increasing factor. Doctor Reeny was quoted as saying that even in child complaints this year anxiety states and depression have been conspicuous and that in almost every instance the illness can be traced to insecurity resulting from unemployment and overcrowded living conditions. Among the symptoms of anxiety conditions are repeated headaches, rapid heartbeats, and suffocation.

Mrs. Tyson, of the Pennsylvania State Welfare Department, quoted Doctor Appel, secretary of health for that State, as saying that in the last three years the reports of health examinations in Pennsylvania show a progressive increase of some 10 or 28 per cent in 1930 in the proportion of children who are underweight and give evidences of malnutrition. Mrs. Tyson, speaking of the limited diets in Fayette County, Pa., referred to by Mr. Kennedy, said that people living on such diets for a long period of time are living "in a condition of semistarvation," and that when men are offered work the testimony is that they are frequently too weak to do it.

Mrs. Tyson further declares that in May, 1932, the Friends Service were feeding hungry children in five or six bituminous counties and that for lack of funds the service was withdrawn last summer and has not been resumed this fall; that Pennsylvania has hardly touched the problem of transient families and homeless men and boys; that in one little town of 2,000 in southwestern Pennsylvania attempts were made to feed 1,500 transients last year; and that many young boys, hungry and tired and broken in spirit, are simply moving on "looking for a frontier." She further said that in Clearfield County, with a population of 86,000, the State physician reports 6,000 malnourished children who needed dental care, glasses, tonsil operations, and, in one county, operations for crippled children can not be secured; also that the hospitals are burdened almost to the breaking point.

Mr. President, I wish now to advert for a moment to what may be called the failure of the compromise legislation of July, 1932, which gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation supervision of unemployment relief.

Mr. Hurlin, director of the statistical department of the Russell Sage Foundation of New York City, stated that in some cities of the country there is an almost ridiculously low rate of relief—such as 27 cents, 30 cents, 39 cents, 43

cents, 63 cents, compared with \$8.93 per capita in Boston. He added that the table placed in the record by him gives evidence that the policy so far followed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has not been directed toward meeting existing needs but merely toward satisfying requirements of the existing law in giving relief, provided certain financial conditions have been met. He further said that it is of the utmost necessity that the law be changed as soon as possible so that a new policy may be adopted which will place at the disposal of the States liberal relief funds.

Dr. S. E. Leland, professor of public finance of the University of Chicago, declared that Federal aid should be outright; that it should not be granted in the form of loans to be collected in more taxes from people who have little or no ability to pay, but the tax should be placed on the entire Nation rather than on State and local units.

Mr. Hodson said that the experience of New York State showed that a Federal grant for relief based on the principle of grants in aid, which means supplementing local resources, and given good administration, will not dry up local resources, but, on the contrary, will stimulate them.

Mr. Betters, executive director of the American Municipal Association, of Chicago, urged that section E of the relief act of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be repealed immediately. That section provides that municipalities, in order to borrow, must put up collateral and is used where a governor, as at one time in the case of Michigan, refused to assume responsibility, as a result of which Detroit had to borrow. Mr. Betters pointed out that section E gives the governor the opportunity to shift responsibility back to the local government, which he does not think Congress intended because of the varying attitude of different governors. As a result cities in one State must issue bonds while others across a State line 50 miles away do not have to issue bonds.

Mr. Betters also objected to the loan basis in the Federal law, pointing out that a State must almost take a pauper's oath before it can get funds and that Governor Lehman had said that the New York Legislature was not going to take the pauper's oath to borrow. That feature has been eliminated in the substitute. He added that if we are going to permit municipalities to issue bonds we are going to have a most serious credit situation facing American cities; that there are already many defaults and that there will be many more; that if Chicago had not authorized a refunding plan for the city's \$24,000,000 bonds there would have been complete financial chaos in Chicago.

Mr. Betters said that the present relief bill in his judgment is "the most sane bill" that can be drawn, especially in regard to distribution. He approved the 40 per cent allotment, and added that there is practically no State which does not need such Federal funds and that the allotment would be equitable.

He also pointed out that, because of the rivalry between cities and rural communities over road-building programs, many governors were reluctant to apply for emergency relief; and that it is bad to tie up the loans with road programs for that reason. He added that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had taken an unsound position in trying to force States to accept additional taxes, for in Illinois this meant forcing the sales tax on the State, when a balanced tax system ought to be possible.

Speaking of the need to repeal section E immediately, he said that defaults in municipal credit would affect the entire credit situation of the country, adding:

I can not see that a default in a city of the size of Detroit is going to have no effect other than within the boundaries of the city of Detroit. It will affect the whole financial credit of the United States.

Mr. Clapp, director of the welfare federation of Cleveland, said that there are definite limits to the plan of loaning one-fifth of possible Federal highway funds years in advance.

Attention has already been directed to Mr. Pickett's testimony about the low standards of relief of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which were at first about \$1 per family per month but which this year have been raised to \$1 per week per family.

Mr. Croxton, representing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, endeavored to avoid that criticism by saying that relief can never be adequate, but conceded that relief is frequently inadequate.

Attention has also been directed to the testimony of Mr. West, page 364, that families in need are often not provided help. This is clearly due in part to the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is an agency waiting for applications for loans. No testimony was given indicating that it reaches out to know the need and tries to make loans which will adequately meet that need.

A striking illustration of this unsatisfactory feature of the operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law was the case of Philadelphia, where relief was abandoned because of lack of funds during July and August, 1932.

It appears necessary to digress long enough to mention this experience in some detail. The cause was the exhaustion of relief funds which were sustaining 52,000 families when relief was withdrawn.

Shortly before this occurred a public statement was issued by leading citizens of Philadelphia that the city was about to pass from civilization to barbarism.

Those who think that the relief problem can be avoided should read the report of a committee of the community council which investigated what actually happened in Philadelphia in the two months while relief was suspended. This report is contained in our testimony. It was prepared by an economist of Philadelphia, Mr. Clague, and describes conditions in the two months when no relief was available for the destitute people of Philadelphia.

From that report I read the following:

People do not starve to death when relief stops; they just starve, with the margin by which life persists maintained by the pity of their neighbors and by a sort of scavenging on the community.

An examination was made by the Philadelphia committee of some 400 families out of more than 50,000 families that were destitute. The committee reported:

Most of them were absolutely dependent for existence on the food orders supplied through State funds administered by the committee for unemployment relief. Then there were no more funds, and relief—except for a little milk for half-sick children, and a little Red Cross flour—was suddenly discontinued. And Philadelphia asked itself what was happening to these 52,000 families. There were no reports of people starving in the streets, and yet from what possible source were 52,000 families getting enough food to live on?

These are some of the facts that were discovered:

The families rustled for themselves as much as they could. A common source of supply for one group was the docks where fruit and vegetables for market are sorted. Children and adults hung around the stalls and snatched at anything that was cast out. Occasionally they were able to make off with good produce, but the police were watchful and such enterprise was often disastrous. Street begging was only occasionally resorted to, said the investigators, likewise the petty thieving of milk and groceries from doorsteps. There is little doubt, however, that gifts of food from grocers, reported by a considerable number of families, were usually obtained by a form of begging. Children, it seems, had the habit of going to a store and by pleading hunger, inducing the grocer to give them a little food. Children ran errands for grocers, watched pushcarts, did anything in exchange for fruit or vegetables. The myriad ways in which a family, its entire attention concentrated on food, just food, succeeded in obtaining it constitutes abundant evidence of the ingenuity and perseverance of these people.

As a result of all these efforts, what did these families have? What meals did they get and of what did these meals consist? About 8 per cent of the total number were subsisting on one meal a day. Many more were getting only two meals a day, and still others were irregular, sometimes one meal, sometimes two, occasionally, by great good fortune, three.

The Bakers, the Beccarias, the MacIntyres, and the other 397 families visited did not starve to death when relief stopped. They kept alive from day to day, catch-as-catch-can, reduced for actual subsistence to something of the status of a stray cat prowling for food, for which a kindly soul occasionally sets out a plate of table scraps or a saucer of milk. What this does to the innate dignity of the human soul is not for this writer to discuss. What it does to the bodies of the social attitudes of adults and children is something that we shall know more and more about for years to come. And these 400 families were, remember, a fair sampling of 52,000 from whom relief was withdrawn. What happened to

the 400 happened in greater or less degree to the 52,000, and will happen again if the exigencies of the winter should force another discontinuance of food orders.

The testimony in the record about medical and other aid having been abandoned in various parts of the country supports the same criticism of the relief features of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act.

Another criticism which frequently appeared in the testimony in regard to the administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law was due to the fact that its loans were made for short-time periods which prevented long-time relief planning. Those who discussed this pointed out that the fear that other money would not be forthcoming for relief had a tremendous effect on families, and whenever fear was expressed in the press demonstrations began at the relief stations arising from other than communistic sources. A witness cited one case of a great mass demonstration at the Loop in Chicago and said that such demonstrations are inspired by facts.

What, then, did the experts offer as desirable further legislation? Witnesses practically without exception favored the proposals of the pending bill, to provide \$500,000,000 at least, administered independently of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Doctor Billikopf pointed out that relief needs, according to those of past experience, will increase for at least a year after the turn for the better in economic conditions. Mr. West noted that Senator Pomerene, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, had suggested in October, 1932, that the \$300,000,000 appropriated in July of that year was expected to last for two years, and will have been practically exhausted in one.

The American Association of Social Workers, on February 4, 1933, confirming what has been said, reported through a subcommittee in favor of standards and safeguards for the use of Federal funds contemplated in the bill of Senator LA FOLLETTE and myself, and pointed out that the relief act of 1932 has definite defects. I ask that this report be incorporated in the RECORD.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS,
New York City, February 4, 1933.

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION

The subcommittee has reviewed the reports of the conference on Federal action made in 1931 in so far as they related to the subject assigned to this committee. It has also reviewed the several measures which have been introduced in Congress in the winter of 1932-33.

The committee has undertaken to redraft a statement of the important safeguards which should be applied to a Federal measure as follows:

RECOMMENDED POLICIES AND PRACTICES

1. Federal aid to States for unemployment relief should be granted when evidence accumulates that any considerable number of States are unable to provide through local and State funds for the minimum adequate relief needs of persons in distress due to unemployment. Such aid should be in the form of grants by which the wider taxing powers and the greater credit resources of the Federal Government may be brought into use in such manner as to stimulate State and local responsibility.

2. Federal administration: Allocation and Federal administration of funds to States should be vested in a small appointive board of persons specially qualified for the task. This board should be empowered to employ social workers and such trained specialists as are necessary. A merit system for selection of this staff is essential. The bill should allow an adequate sum for the administrative expenses of the board and its staff.

3. Allocation of funds: The policy of matching Federal funds with State funds should be followed, but provision should also be made for a discretionary fund.

4. It should be the policy and practice of the Federal Board to assist the States in every possible way in the development of necessary local and State machinery for relief and service to those in need. The essential components of such State administration consist of:

(a) Local units able to give quick and effective relief and services, organized on county or city lines.

(b) An effective State administrative unit for the direction and supervision of the expenditures of State and Federal funds for relief purposes. This unit should have authority to allocate funds within the State, and set standards of local relief administration and of personnel. Where the existing State welfare department is or can be made adequate for these purposes, it should be

designated as the State administrative unit unless other adequate relief administration has already been established.

The Federal board, through powers granted to it, can be of effective help in the encouragement and development of adequate State administrative units. To that purpose it should have power to give the State financial assistance to be applied not only to relief but also to service costs.

The Federal board should have sufficient authority over the standards of administration in the States so that it may withhold appropriations which in its opinion would not be properly spent for the needs of the unemployed. It is understood, however, that the influence of a skillful Federal administration would be exercised in the development of economical and humane standards of local and State administration through educational processes rather than through the withholding of appropriations. Allocations should be made for a period of not less than six months in advance, to permit the State administration to develop stable programs, employ proper personnel with some guaranty of security of tenure, and avoid uncertainty and insecurity to those in need of relief.

5. As a corollary to the above, the Federal Government should have its dealings with State governments and not assume the responsibility for allocation of Federal funds within the States. The Federal board should, however, have the power to call for such detailed information as it deems necessary concerning needs and resources of the political subdivisions within the States.

The administration of Federal aid should include provisions for the transient and homeless; that is, individuals or families without legal settlement. Legal restrictions and local practices of long standing now exaggerated by lack of local resources for adequate care of residents creates a particularly acute problem. Special provisions are necessary through Federal funds granted to States for cooperation between localities within States and across State lines in returning transients to their legal residences when such action is socially desirable, and also for providing shelters and other methods of treatment.

EMERGENCY RELIEF AND CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1932

In comparing the provisions for Federal relief under the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 with the points deemed essential as in the above statement the committee reports the following conclusions:

1. The act does not conform to the provision that Federal aid should be in the form of grants.
2. The act provides no special board to administer Federal funds. The allocation of funds has been a minor responsibility of the board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
3. The act does not establish a matching policy.
4. The act does not give the Reconstruction Finance Corporation specific authority to assist in the development of State administrative programs. The Federal administration under the act has, however, been of such assistance to States in several instances. However, the practice of making advances on short notice and for a period of not more than one or two months has been a severe handicap to sound State planning.
5. The act does not confine the Federal administration's relations to the States. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has under section E dealt directly with subdivisions of States and under section C has also assumed responsibility jointly with States for allocation of funds to particular subdivisions.
6. Since the act does not provide grants, provisions for homeless and transients have eventually to be financed from local and State treasuries and must necessarily receive only secondary consideration in communities hard pressed for adequate provision for their own residents.

THE COSTIGAN-LA FOLLETTE BILL, S. 5125

Comparison has also been made between the policies and practices as stated by this committee and S. 5125, as amended, and reported by the Committee on Manufactures, as follows:

1. The bill does provide that Federal aid shall be given in the form of grants.
2. The bill does vest allocation and Federal administration in a small board especially appointed.
3. The bill does provide for matching Federal funds with State funds, through section 4-A, and also provides a reserve fund which can be allocated by the Federal board on the basis of need.
4. The bill does not specifically provide for the type of State and local administration nor insure the standards of administration which the committee believes are necessary, but sufficient power is given the Federal board to permit, if not to insure, an effective administration.
5. The bill does provide that the Federal board should have its dealings with State governments and not with political subdivisions thereof.
6. The bill does provide for the use of Federal funds for the transient and homeless.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt the Senator's remarks. I did desire, if he had time, to ask him about two questions for my own benefit as to the difference between the two bills so as to have it in the Record.

Mr. COSTIGAN. May I, with due respect, ask the Senator to defer his questions until I conclude? I hope then to have time to answer.

One point made by the report of this subcommittee with respect to the substitute of the Senator from New York [Mr.

WAGNER], by implication at least, is that it does not, except for transients, give relief in the form of grants.

Next, the substitute does not provide a special board to supervise the distribution of the Federal funds, although the Senator from New York in December of last year stated to the Senate that he then favored such independent supervision by experts.

Another suggestion stressed in the report is that a State matching policy is desirable. This is not provided in the substitute of the Senator from New York.

It is further urged that the law enacted last July has not led the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to aid the development of State administrative relief programs; also, that the practice of making short-time advances on loans for periods of one or two months has imposed hardships on State and city planning. So far as I am aware, that defect is not corrected in the substitute of the Senator from New York.

It is also urged that a proper bill—the substitute does not have this limitation—should confine the Federal Government's relief relations to States and not extend them to cities. The effect on municipal credit of the present practice has already been indicated.

The report of experts, therefore, indorses the pending bill, not the substitute offered by the Senator from New York.

But time restrictions compel me to conclude, and, unusual though that course may be, I do so not with the customary appeal for the enactment of the pending measure, the desirability and importance of which are apparent to all. Every heart, except it be of bloodless stone, must be moved by the desperate lot of millions out of work whose proudest boast heretofore has been their American citizenship. Nothing, I venture to say, can justify the continuance of an attitude which does not recognize the necessity for immediate, noble, national relief of human distress due to our economic catastrophe. For good or ill, therefore, it is as certain as anything human can be that the vote of the Senate this afternoon, except for the record, is already a finality.

For sound reasons I conclude by paying tribute to the fine men and women, both in and out of this Chamber, who have been supporting constructive and adequate legislation for Federal relief aid. Especially is praise due to public opinion, which for the most part has been in advance of its leadership. Especially is good government indebted to the independent press, including the publications of organized labor, which has consistently recognized the gravity of human need and has supported the demand for adequate statutory relief. Fortunately, there are to-day, as there were in the heroic past, representatives of living journalism in places of power who believe that the supreme task of the writer is to influence human life continuously in the direction of justice and human welfare.

Mr. President, following my remarks I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a brief editorial on the pending bill from the New Republic, as well as a series of editorials from the Washington Daily News, which have received wide circulation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New Republic for February 8, 1933]

The problem of finding enough money for relief of the unemployed is steadily growing more serious. Both private charity and municipal funds are about at the end of their rope, and many of the individual States have also exhausted their resources. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is reported to have loaned to 37 States \$145,000,000 of its \$300,000,000 fund, but additional needs already in sight will more than eat up the balance. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, operating on its general policy of giving as little as possible (except to banks) wraps itself in a maze of red tape which the States find it almost impossible to break through. Moreover, the fact that it merely lends the money makes some States hesitate to apply for relief, a fact which in turn contributes to the misery into which at least a fifth of our population is now plunged. Harry L. Hopkins, New York State chairman of the emergency relief organization, estimates that 500,000 families which are in need of relief are not getting it. Even those who are being aided receive pitifully inadequate amounts. The maximum anywhere in the United States is now about \$1 per person per week. In some States it

is only 50 cents. Trying to keep body and soul together on 7 cents a day is only slow starvation.

In view of the inevitable necessities of the next few months, a bill has been introduced in the Senate for further Federal relief. A combination of the Costigan-La Follette and Cutting bills, it appropriates \$500,000,000 to be expended in the next two years. The money would not be granted in the form of loans but as an outright contribution by the American Government to keep American citizens from starvation. Forty per cent of this money would be distributed among the States on a basis of population and the other 60 per cent held in reserve to be sent where the need was greatest. The money would be raised through the sale of Reconstruction Finance Corporation debentures and would, therefore, not constitute an immediate drain upon the Treasury. A special appropriation of \$15,000,000 would be spent in the attempt to rescue America's "wild boys," the hundreds of thousands of lads, mostly between the ages of 15 and 20, whom the depression has turned loose upon the highways. This bill deserves to pass; if it fails to do so in the present Congress, it will be brought up again in the April session which now seems inevitable. Mr. Roosevelt is understood to favor it, and his influence in that session will be great.

[From the Washington News for January 13, 1933]

HUMANITY'S CALL

The chief opposition to the Costigan-La Follette \$500,000,000 direct relief act seems to be not that it is superfluous, but that it is without precedent. Here, some are saying, is something new and untried in America, a Federal dole.

Records of the United States Treasury will reassure them. These records reveal that since 1803 the United States Government has responded to the call of distress 114 times.

Seldom before, the records will show, has America failed to come to the aid of sufferers either in far-off lands or at home. Whether the sufferers were victims of flood, fire, or famine or hurricane, drought, or earthquake Uncle Sam has not failed to reach into his pocket, nor has he passed by on the other side.

Since 1812 Congress has voted money to relieve the victims of foreign disasters nine times. In 1919 it granted \$100,000,000 for the American Relief Administration. The American Relief Administration, under Herbert Hoover, distributed a billion dollars in all, feeding upwards of 200,000,000 persons in 20 countries of Europe. At one time it was giving warm meals to 4,000,000 children. Other Federal beneficences abroad included aid to victims of Russian famine; Japanese, Venezuelan, Costa Rican, and Italian earthquakes; Chinese famine; and French West Indian tornadoes.

Our charities begin at home. Since 1803 Congress has made appropriations for domestic relief no less than 61 times. Some of these appropriations appear as loans, most of them as grants. Not counting the \$300,000,000 hunger loan fund made available for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation last year, total Federal disbursements for domestic disaster relief to date amount to \$650,533,362. From 1827, when Congress voted \$20,000 for the relief of fire victims in Alexandria, Va., until last July, when it gave out \$40,000,000 worth of Farm Board wheat and cotton for Red Cross distribution to depression victims, the United States of America has kept up its record as a generous giver.

Never, until now, has Uncle Sam turned deaf ear to humanity's cry. And this time he is deaf to the call from his own people.

The time for Federal giving is here again. It was here a year ago when spokesmen from scores of cities told Congress they were at the end of their resources. Testimony of social workers at the current hearings on the Costigan-La Follette bill shows how much more critical is the need to-day. They estimate from 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 Americans in distress now.

"Unless Federal aid be changed from a loan basis to direct aid, American cities are going to have defaults which will shake not only municipal credit, but the whole credit structure of the United States," said Paul V. Betters, executive director of the American Municipal Association. "Cities are crippling essential services to meet relief needs. They are facing default. The present system only stimulates financial chaos."

[From the Washington News for January 28, 1933]

THE WAR ON HUNGER

A hunger relief bill has been voted out of committee and is before the United States Senate for action in the short session. Combining the Costigan-La Follette and Cutting bills, it is a life-line for 3,500,000 destitute families and 1,000,000 homeless youths.

The revised bill separates hunger relief from business and public works loans. A separate board of three, including an expert social worker, would administer outright grants to the States. Of the \$500,000,000 set aside for the next two years \$15,000,000 is earmarked for transient care. These sums are desperately needed.

The country is spending \$1,000,000,000 a year now on relief. More than a third of the unemployed are on charity. But every report proves that the States and communities are about at the end of their resources. Private charities and local public funds are depleted. We have now reached the third phase of the relief campaign, Federal aid.

At the Senate committee hearings two score of relief workers from many States testified. They had come in from the firing line. Practically all of them said that the fight against hunger is

going against them. Practically all urged quick and ample Federal grants.

If anyone doubts that this rich country's enemy to-day is hunger, let him listen to these hunger fighters:

Harry L. Hopkins, New York State chairman of emergency relief: "At a conservative estimate there are 500,000 families in the United States not getting relief who should be receiving it."

Van Bittner, United Mine Workers, Fairmont, W. Va.: "Our people are hungry. Our children are crying for bread. They do not have sufficient clothing to protect them from the blasts of winter."

Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, Chairman Joint Committee on Unemployment: "Semistarvation is sweeping across the country with the ravages of a plague in its wake."

Dr. Jacob Billikopf, Philadelphia Federation of Jewish Charities: "Many States have no resources to fall back on. The majority of cities are smashed and crippled financially. You can't expect unemployment relief from them."

H. L. Lurie, Bureau of Social Research, N. Y.: "Few of the large relief agencies are giving as much as \$1 a week per person for food and in some of the organized cities the amount has fallen to as low as 50 cents per person per week."

Miss Helen Hall, University Settlement, Philadelphia: "Philadelphia has gone through four periods when there was no money for unemployment relief. Of the 52,000 destitute families left without relief 37 per cent were not getting the normal three meals a day."

Clarence E. Pickett, American Friends Service Committee, on conditions in Kentucky and West Virginia mine regions: "Warm clothing is almost nonexistent. In Kentucky I received notice that three schools had to close because of trachoma. One looks with a certain amount of trepidation to what might happen if millions of our people might come to feel that the State is their enemy."

Karl De Schweinitz, Philadelphia Community Council, on overcrowding due to evictions: "Out of every 1,000 families applying for help 220 families are living with somebody else. One child said: 'In the last year we have lived with six different families. At first they were glad to have us, but after a while they get very tired of you.'"

Samuel A. Goldsmith, Chicago Jewish Charities: "With Chicago standards you would need a Federal fund of well over a billion dollars. It is a terrific figure, but we are in a war."

We are in a war. In the last war we spent \$35,000,000,000 in two years to beat the enemy overseas. Shall we refuse to spend one-seventh of that to beat the enemy at home?

[From the Washington News for February 4, 1933]

STARVING CHILDREN

The attention of complacent Congressmen, governors, and legislators is respectfully called to a warning from Health Commissioner Wynne of New York City that the death rate from undernourishment is increasing among children.

Doctor Wynne told the welfare council's health section that 25 per cent of his city's school children to-day show signs of undernourishment compared with 15 per cent a year ago, a fact that probably will be reflected in an increase in the death rate this year. New York's school teachers have spent \$2,000,000 helping feed their pupils. New York State has bonded itself for \$30,000,000 for relief, and New York City leads all communities in the extent of its giving. Yet in these children's homes it is found that the gas has been turned off and many children are eating raw food. Clothing is scanty. Many go to bed with no covering.

"This can not go on much longer," Doctor Wynne declared. Here is an official report from the richest city of the richest State of the richest nation of the world. It shows that helpless children slowly are being permitted to sicken and die from lack of food and warmth.

What is happening in poorer States and communities may well be imagined.

Starvation is a bitter word. Yet there is no other word for the weakening brought on by insufficient and improper food. Starvation of children during a famine may be inevitable. Starvation of children in this well-stocked land is criminal.

Testifying before a Senate committee this week Prof. Haven Emerson said distributed relief is too low to permit "growth of children, to maintain a reasonable degree of resistance to infections of various kinds, or to prevent deterioration of the human stock, if long continued."

Miss Grace Abbott, chief of the United States Children's Bureau, testified that "no one familiar with relief believes the needs have been met anywhere."

Congress should pass the Costigan-La Follette and Wagner relief bills for the winter's fight on hunger.

[From the Washington News for February 9, 1933]

WHEN RELIEF STOPS

Half relief for needy families has become a commonplace in this land of plenty. Some American cities and States facing empty treasuries may be interested to know what happens when relief is shut off entirely. This has occurred no less than four times in Philadelphia.

What did its 52,000 destitute families do when the City of Brotherly Love failed them? The Community Council set out to

answer this question. It studied the condition of 400 typical forgotten families. It reported:

"People do not starve to death when relief stops; they just starve by the margin with which life persists, maintained by the pity of their neighbors and by a sort of scavenging on the community.

"The families rustled for themselves as much as they could. A common source of supply for one group was the docks where fruit and vegetables for market are sorted. Children and adults hung around the stalls and snatched at anything that was cast out. . . . Street begging was only occasionally resorted to, likewise the petty thieving of milk and groceries from doorsteps. . . . Children, it seems, had the habit of going to a store and by pleading hunger inducing the grocer to give them a little food. Children ran errands, watched pushcarts, did anything in exchange for fruit or vegetables. The myriad ways in which a family, its entire attention concentrated on food—just food—succeeded in obtaining it constitutes abundant evidence of the ingenuity and perseverance of these people.

"What meals did they get and of what did these meals consist? About 8 per cent were subsisting on one meal a day. . . . Thirty-seven per cent of all families were not getting the normal three meals a day. . . . They kept alive from day to day, catch-as-catch-can, reduced for actual subsistence to something of the status of a stray cat prowling for food."

Chairman Miller, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, admits that the Government's hunger relief loan fund will be exhausted by June. If Congress adjourns without replenishing that fund through passage of the Costigan-La Follette and Wagner bills, it will help turn more American families into such as these.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If there is time, it will be a pleasure to answer the questions of the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have already addressed the Senate at length upon this question. I shall, therefore, consume only a moment to explain what I regard as the difference between the substitute bill and the bill proposed by the Senators from Wisconsin and Colorado.

At the outset I want to say that if there is any implication in the remarks of either the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Colorado reflecting upon my desire to help in providing relief for the destitute I think that my record and my efforts in that regard since I became a Member of this body are a complete answer to any such suggestion or to any reflection upon the sincerity of my activities.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I wish merely to state at this time that there was no concealed implication in my remarks with respect to the public devotion and regard for the public welfare, especially in the industrial field, of the able Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the Senator.

Further than that observation, I shall disregard the criticism made by the Senator from Wisconsin as to the effect of the substitute which I have offered on the question of bringing relief to the destitute. I recognize that in his sincerity and earnestness in behalf of his own legislation he, perhaps, was tempted to overstate his own case. That is a perfectly natural limitation that we all have; and it must, therefore, in my judgment, be overlooked.

Nevertheless, there is no difference between the legislation proposed by me to relieve destitution and that proposed by the Senators from Wisconsin and Colorado except this fundamental distinction:

The payments made to the States under the bill which I proposed are in the nature of loans. The payments made to the States under the Costigan-La Follette bills are outright grants. That is the fundamental distinction and the only distinction.

As to the amount of money which is appropriated or authorized in both cases, there is practically no distinction. I provide \$300,000,000, and that, together with the amount which is still available with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the relief of destitution, amounts altogether to \$450,000,000. Under the Costigan-La Follette bill the amount authorized is \$500,000,000, so that at most there is a difference of \$50,000,000.

There is a restriction, however, upon the distribution under the Costigan-La Follette bill which does not exist in

the legislation which I have proposed. And may I say, by way of interpolation, that I have never been much interested in the method of distribution of the funds. What I have been concerned with and interested in was that funds should be available to the States and to the municipalities to feed the needy and the destitute.

Two hundred million of the five hundred million dollars authorized under the Costigan-La Follette bill is to be distributed among the States according to population, with one restriction; and I think under the present economic and fiscal situation of the States and municipalities it is a serious restriction, because it provides that for every \$66 granted under the provisions of the La Follette-Costigan bill a State must match with \$100. So that if a State is in financial straits where its burden has become so heavy that it can not raise a sufficient sum to match the particular fund which would be available under the Costigan-La Follette bill, the sum actually granted will be considerably reduced. I regard that as a very serious restriction. There is no such restriction in the substitute proposed by me.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Senator from New York, of course, knows that under the pending bill money not distributed on the 40 per cent basis would be passed into a reserve fund, and that the reserve fund would be available for relief on the basis of need.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; I think that is so. I have adopted a method of loans and advances, because Congress in the last session decided by an overwhelming vote that it would not authorize the appropriation of these funds except by way of loans or advances to the States, and I do not want to indulge in pure futilities. I do not see that it gets bread to the destitute to stand for some so-called principle of grants as against loans if, in the end, by pursuing that policy, we invite a veto and the hungry get nothing. I took a more pragmatic view of the situation. In my anxiety to see that funds were available for the needy and the destitute, I framed my legislation so as to secure congressional approval and approval at the White House.

Mr. President, in view of the expressions of the President in reference to all legislation of this character, we are simply courting a veto by insisting upon distributing these moneys as grants to the States rather than as loans. It is for that reason that I adopted the loan system.

This is even more than I had wanted to say, Mr. President, except to assure the Senate that there is just this choice between the two bills—namely, are you for an outright grant or are you for advances or loans to the States?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I desire to ask the Senator one or two questions in order that I may get the difference between the measures clear in my own mind, and perhaps some others may be interested in the questions.

As I understand it, the administration, under the Senator's substitute, would be in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and under the Costigan-La Follette bill the administration would be by a board of three to be appointed by the President.

Mr. WAGNER. The distribution of the funds; yes.

Mr. BLACK. Is there any difference between the powers given to the board proposed to be set up under the Costigan-La Follette bill, and the powers to be given to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with reference to distribution of funds and supervision of the distribution?

Mr. WAGNER. I could not call it any very great distinction. I think there is a little more detailed provision, requiring plans to be submitted by the States to the board of three, and supervision over the funds to be distributed by the States, which I do not think is present in my legislation, and I doubt whether the power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would go quite as far in the way of supervising the distribution of the funds within the States as would the power of the board to be created under the Costigan-La Follette bill.

Mr. BLACK. I might state to the Senator that, as I view it, the powers are practically the same, and the Senator seems to concur in that interpretation.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not quite concur in that. I say that under the Costigan-La Follette bill the powers of actual supervision over the distribution of funds within the State are broader than under the bill which I have offered, and I can see a reason for that. Under the bill I have proposed, the money provided by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is an advance or a loan to the State, and it becomes the property of the State the moment it is transmitted; whereas under the Costigan-La Follette bill it is Federal money, and under the theory of that legislation the Federal Government has the ultimate power of distribution of the fund within the State. I do not think there is any question about that. I do not think that will be contested by the advocates of the measure.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We contend that the power over distribution would aid in the establishment of sound relief standards.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; but the Senator does not dispute the statement that under his measure the distribution of the money would really be supervised and directed by the Federal Government.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not at all.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator does not dispute that, does he?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The immediate distribution of the funds would be thus supervised, but after the funds passed, the control, of course, would be vested in the separate States as fully as under the Senator's measure.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question, if he will permit, though it is probably directed to both Senators. As I understand it, the difference between the bills is that under the Wagner substitute, as we now have it, the State would receive the money and set up its own organization for the relief of the unemployed. That is our system now.

Mr. WAGNER. The money would be advanced to the States as loans or advances, and then it would become the property of the State, and the responsibility would be on the States to distribute it.

Mr. LONG. Under the La Follette-Costigan bill—

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same result would happen, under the condition that the States would submit in advance the plans under which they proposed to use the relief funds.

Mr. LONG. We do that now.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know what the Louisiana practice is, but the pending measure looks to that course.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, if the distribution is to be the same, and if everything else is to be the same, why the mysterious criticism that under my bill we would have a lowering of standards, and people going destitute and hungry without aid? What justification is there for the criticism that my proposal is an effort to lower the standards of aid to the needy of the States?

Mr. COSTIGAN and Mr. LA FOLLETTE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield to all Senators.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Permit me to say, before the Senator from Wisconsin speaks, that for seven months and more we have had in operation the loan practices of the Federal Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The results have been highly unsatisfactory for the reasons already assigned. It is the contention of those best informed in this field that if the Federal Government supervises the distribution of the funds, as in the case of other Federal State-aid acts, it can make more uniform the relief practices to be followed in the States, including the determination of actual relief needs, and can, without interfering with State control, set up highly desirable relief standards, many of which have been totally neglected under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York on the amendment has expired. He has 30 minutes on the bill.

Mr. WAGNER. I will take my 30 minutes on the bill.

I want to ask the Senator from Colorado this question: If the bill which I propose contained a provision for a separate board, would that satisfy the Senator?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not at all. That would be an admirable addition to the Senator's substitute, but would not correct other defects.

Mr. WAGNER. In other words, the Senator is for a grant rather than for an advance or loan. Is not that the fact?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is one fact.

Mr. WAGNER. What else is there?

Mr. COSTIGAN. For one thing, the present law, which the Senator from New York desires to perpetuate, results in short-time advances, guarded by bankers, who are thinking in terms of loans rather than the needs of the unemployed, and people in distress are not receiving anything like the relief to which, by intent of the law we enacted, they are entitled. Overwhelming evidence so shows.

Mr. WAGNER. I agree with the Senator, and I therefore view with a good deal of satisfaction the prospect that, after the 4th of March, there will be a rather more sympathetic administration. But I have inquired of a number of the States, and they have not found any fault with the methods in which their applications for funds for the destitute were handled.

I have an appreciation, I want to assure the Senator, of this whole situation. I am not an alarmist, but we have for some time been going along pursuing an aimless policy, putting our heads into the sand and refusing to see the actual facts. In my judgment, an examination of the economic statistics, and an observation of the present misery, as to the existence of which we do not need statistics, convince me that we are in a life and death struggle with the forces of social and economic dissolution; and unless we call upon all the resources of the people of the country, as well as of the Government, to join in this fray we can not prevent disintegration. No one can be more earnest than I am in desiring to bring about the maximum activity on the part of the Federal Government, first, to feed the needy and the destitute so that none shall go hungry or unsheltered; and second, to provide activities by way of a public-works program so as to afford opportunity for employment. We must do these things or we can not arrest the processes of disintegration. There can be no question about what my attitude upon this whole matter is, and I want to make certain that the necessary money will be made available. I am going to be practical enough to propose that sort of bill which will bring aid, and, at the same time, afford reasonable assurance that it will meet the approval of the White House.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, there is so much that the Senator from New York has said with which I agree that I hardly know where to begin to state my agreement. As to the economic dangers of the hour I am in entire concurrence with him.

As to the personal qualities of the incoming President of the United States I am also in complete accord, but I confess that I do not wish to deal with legislation on the principle that one President will favorably administer a law and another President will frown on its proper application for the benefit of society. A year ago we similarly met many hidden intimations as to what the President of the United States might do with relief legislation. I believed then as now that it is our duty to legislate, and it is the duty of the Chief Executive to deal with our measures as he deems best under the Constitution. Then as now I favored legislation which is scientific, sound, and humane.

I wish merely to repeat to the Senator from New York that the relief law under which we have been operating has wholly failed to meet the needs of the country. Uncounted thousands in America have been and are at this hour not receiving proper or any relief and are therefore driven to

appeal for miserable pittance to the poor who are good to the poor. Under the loan principle in legislation I am convinced that we shall not reach anywhere the provision for the deserving people of the country that will be achieved under grants for aid provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator appreciates there is no difference in the amount authorized in the two bills?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Only \$200,000,000.

Mr. WAGNER. No. The Senator's bill provides an authorization of \$500,000,000 and my bill, including the amount still available with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, provides for \$450,000,000. Furthermore, under the La Follette-Costigan bill \$200,000,000 are subjected to severe restrictions, as I have already pointed out. The maximum difference between the two bills is \$50,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I promised to yield to the Senator from Kentucky, and I do so now.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with the colloquy proceeding if it will clarify the situation. Unfortunately for me it has not done so yet. I want to see if I can ascertain just what are the points of difference. I understand the bill of the Senators from Colorado and Wisconsin provides outright an authorization, to be followed by an appropriation of \$500,000,000 out of the Treasury.

Mr. WAGNER. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. I say out of the Treasury. Of course, it is through the agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation prior to its extraction from the Treasury. It is coming from the Treasury, no matter whether it comes from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or outside of it. But it is a grant, not a loan—an outright grant from the Federal Government to the States, which is to be administered here in Washington primarily.

Mr. WAGNER. The plan is to be submitted to a separate board showing the method the States propose to use in distributing the funds.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is now done under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act.

Mr. BARKLEY. They have simply increased the present \$300,000,000 available, or that was available when we passed the bill last year, by another \$300,000,000.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That makes a total of \$600,000,000 to be advanced to the States in the form of loans. We are still entertaining the hope it will be repaid, although we know it will not be.

Mr. WAGNER. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me unfortunate that those of us who are so much concerned about relief should find differences as to the method of its administration. I am wondering whether the new plan suggested of a grant, and a requirement that plans for distribution shall be set up and submitted in advance, will in any way interfere with or operate to destroy or make useless the machinery that has already been set up in the States for the administration of the funds which have already been available. Unfortunately I was engaged elsewhere and did not hear the category of criticism made by the Senator from Colorado against the present method of distribution.

In my own State, with the exception of some dissatisfaction growing out of the fact that instead of paying money to the people they pay groceries and supplies, I have had no complaints as to the administration of the fund. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has completely and fully complied with the requests which have been made by the governor of my State, which have been based upon expert information obtained from all the counties, and that expert information brought to Washington and submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With very few exceptions, it has been accepted by the authorities here and the loans or allotments made upon that basis.

So far as I am concerned, I would object to any scheme by which the expert forces that have already been set up in the States to gather information upon which to base the distri-

bution of this relief are to be rendered useless and done away with in order that some other State officers or agencies may be set up in the States.

I am wondering in what particular there is a difference between the bills in that respect?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further? He has been very generous.

Mr. WAGNER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish merely to say to the Senator from Kentucky that there will be no such scrapping of the existing machinery as he contemplates, because the pending bill provides that the governor shall designate the agency through which the Federal relief board is to turn over the money for distribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, we know that already they are submitting to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in advance in each county—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will take 10 minutes to read the report submitted by the committee, he will know all about the pending bill.

Mr. WAGNER. If that distribution is satisfactory, I do not see the point in setting up another bureau appointed by the President of the United States to do the same thing.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is my difficulty.

Mr. WAGNER. However, I am really sorry that so much time is being taken up on the method of distribution. The fundamental question is, Are we prepared to abandon the theory of a loan or an advance to the States, to which we have adhered thus far, in favor of an outright grant to the States? That basically is the difference between the two bills. The other differences involve details which we are exaggerating and which are not really very important.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield further to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know what it will lead to if we are now to depart from the theory of making loans and embark upon the absolute grant of money out of the Federal Treasury to the States. We must not overlook the fact that last week there was a delegation of mayors in the city of Washington who appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the Senator and I are both members, asking that the Federal Government advance to those cities money out of the Federal Treasury with which to meet maturing obligations on their bonds. If we can do that as to past expenses, the next step will be to advance money out of the Treasury to carry on the cities in all of their relationships to the people in the communities where they exist.

I am wondering just how far we are going to be able to go in loading down the Treasury of the United States in Washington with the burden of operating all of the subdivisions of our Government, to wit, the States, counties, and cities.

Mr. WAGNER. As a matter of fact, the Senator should have added that one of the other proposals of the mayors called for loans to finance the operating expenses of the municipalities in addition to the meeting of maturities.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Treasury at Washington is to take over the operation of the cities, I suppose it would have the right to demand that whatever taxes are collected in those cities shall be turned over to the Federal Treasury as an offset against the expenses of operating the cities. If we are to start in on that sort of a program, we might as well abolish State lines and county lines, cities and municipalities, and say this is one large Federal Nation and all of its branches are to be operated here in Washington.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Senator from New York will doubtless allow a word in reply. The Senator from New York has been contending that under his loan provisions we are

to give the same relief aid to the States as under grants. If that be true, much of our discussion has been irrelevant. We are planning to relieve the hungry and starving in this country under either plan. Our contention is that we are going to do that better by grants than by loans.

In the State of Kentucky, under the loan plan, children have been going blind for lack of food and relief help. The real tragedy there, as I view it, is that under the loan law, as operated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, not enough money has been loaned to Kentucky to take care of these unfortunate victims of our economic depression. That is one of the defects we criticize in the law, but only one.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress put upon the shoulders of the governors of the States the obligation of asking for funds. The governor has asked for funds. In my State they have been granting every dollar the governor has asked for. He based his request on expert investigation and information, not furnished by State or county officials or by candidates for office, but by social workers who are trained in the art of understanding the needs of the people. If the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has not loaned the money that was needed it has been either because the governor did not request it—and I am sure that he did request all that was represented to him as being needed—or we did not make enough money available in the first place for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to the States.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As pointed out before the Senator from Kentucky entered the Chamber, there are some States from which no requests have come for funds, where nevertheless semistarvation exists. Under the loan act some governors have not applied for Federal aid, for one reason or other. Presumably they could not or would not commit the credit of the States for such loans or they concluded that the States would be so obligated to return borrowed funds and it was not desirable to make the necessary applications.

Mr. WAGNER. May I ask the Senator what particular State has failed to make application because of the requirements of the law?

Mr. COSTIGAN. My statement was that presumably the requests had not been made because of constitutional restrictions or because of the obligation resting upon the State to return the funds.

Mr. WAGNER. But the Senator does not know of any case?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not attempt to speak for particular States. However, I understand that the State of New York, for one, made no such request until recently, because of constitutional restrictions, and because the head of that State would not take the pauper oath and go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with his hat in his hand. Yet the evidence shows that there are thousands of families in New York State which have not been receiving adequate or any relief under Reconstruction Finance Corporation management.

Mr. WAGNER. I can say, however, that New York State was given the loan it sought. It asked for a specific sum and that loan was made.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Under a very recent request?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; a very recent request.

Mr. COSTIGAN. But for months and months, until the present Governor of New York came into office with his notably humanitarian outlook, no such request was made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. A State certainly is not to be criticised, nor the governor of that State, merely because he does not rush in as soon as the gate is open to get his share of the sum set apart by Congress. I think it is rather to the credit of any governor who did not apply for a loan until it was necessary to do so.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No such criticism is justified by anything I said.

Mr. WAGNER. I might say so far as New York State is concerned that application was not made until it was abso-

lutely necessary to seek the supplemental aid of the Federal Government because of the terrific burden which we have carried for several years.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I have not been able to be here during the discussion which has occurred on this bill.

Mr. WAGNER. So I read.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] goes on to state that there are a number of people not receiving help under the present law, who, as I understand, he intends to take care of under his bill. Just wherein does the matter come in, whether it is a grant or a loan, by which, under the La Follette-Costigan bill, they are going to be taken care of? That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the first place, Mr. President, under the grant provisions of the pending bill there would be an outright appropriation of 40 per cent of the funds provided for to the various States, with a qualifying provision as to the amounts raised in the separate States. There would be an immediate sum of money placed in the hands of the governor of each State of the Union for relief purposes. The balance of the money would go into what is termed a "reserve fund" to be used on the basis of need.

At present nothing may be secured under our relief law for unfortunates where relief is urgently needed, except through applications for loans, which may or may not be granted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There is one distinguishing feature.

Beyond that, there is under the pending bill better opportunity for expert management. Surveys would doubtless be made of human needs, and relief standards provided more effectively to take care of those who are starving.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield further, I happen to know that my State was the first one that received one of these relief loans. We had had a welfare organization in Louisiana administering a fund which had been raised by private subscription. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation adopted the same system which we had been using to dispense the funds under the Wagner bill, and I have been told that that is the basis on which a large majority of the States have been dispensing the funds. I have not been able to see any material difference. We do not ever expect to pay that money back; we have borrowed it, and we say it is a loan; but we know we are never going to pay it back, as the Senator from Kentucky says. So I do not see what difference it really makes. I do not think a governor will hesitate to ask for it under either one. I can not see why he should. The provision as to 20 per cent of the Federal relief funds for public roads does not mean anything to anybody. I do not see the difference. I may be wrong and I may not understand the bill.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield further—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Senator from Louisiana certainly sees the difference between funds passed out by those who treat and use those funds with a banker's caution and funds used with a view to human relief. This is the most notable difference between the two proposals. No one has been more frankly critical of Reconstruction Finance Corporation management under the present relief act than the Senator from New York in the past. He led the protests on this floor on December 19 last, and insisted that the hour had come for an expert board to take charge of Federal

relief, so that we might have an end to the present penny-pinching attitude in passing out relief aid.

In the case of Louisiana doubtless similar results would be attained after you had in your hands the amounts allotted for relief.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I might say to the Senator from Louisiana that—

Mr. LONG. Please do not read the figures.

Mr. WAGNER. I will have to read them. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has already advanced for the relief of the destitute in the State of Louisiana the sum of \$4,751,333.

Mr. LONG. I understand it has loaned \$6,000,000.

Mr. WAGNER. The State has received \$2,000,000 since?

Mr. LONG. Yes, sir.

Mr. GLASS. The figures I have here show the loan to have been \$7,600,000.

Mr. LONG. I do not think we would get very much under this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators will address the Chair.

Mr. LONG. I beg pardon. If the Senator from New York will yield further, I desire to say that we have received in Louisiana between six and seven million dollars. Now, as I understand, my State would get, under the La Follette bill, around \$3,000,000, would it not?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is, I believe, under the 40 per cent provision.

Mr. WAGNER. And the State would have to match that.

Mr. LONG. We would have to match it.

Mr. WAGNER. The State would have to match it 100 for 60.

Mr. LONG. We can not match anything.

Mr. COSTIGAN. But the State would not have to match a penny if it could not do so.

Mr. LONG. If we made a pauper's oath to show that we could not.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The State would apply for relief under the reserve fund.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, has my time expired?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has one more minute.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

Mr. WAGNER. Does the Senator from Virginia desire to ask me a question?

Mr. GLASS. I do not think the Senator could answer the question that I propose to ask in one minute.

Mr. WAGNER. I surrender the floor.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the question I intended to ask the Senator from New York, which he may answer in my time, is, Where do Senators expect this money to come from? Is it to be picked out of the air or is it to be donated to us by some foreign government? We talk about aiding the States, but it has puzzled me to determine just precisely how it is aiding the States if we tax the people of the States, bring their revenues here and impound them in the Federal Treasury, and then erect a Federal system of distribution of money that we have taken from the States, doling it out to States as the judgment of these Federal minions may dictate.

I conceive the idea that the people of Virginia, through their State administrative authorities, are vastly more competent to determine the needs of that State than is any Federal board instituted here at Washington. After all, the only way for the Federal Government to get any money, unless resort is had to the printing-press expedient, is to take it from the pockets of the taxpayers of the respective 48 States; and it is beyond my human wit to determine how we are aiding the States when we first take the money from their taxpayers, bring it here to Washington, and then, as I have said, dispense it in dribblets back to the States as the humanitarian instincts or judgment of a Federal board may suggest.

One of the Senators has suggested that he does not expect his State to pay this money back, and I do not either. I note here, and I am ashamed to note it, that the State of Virginia has borrowed \$2,700,000 from this fund. I would feel utterly ashamed of Virginia if I could think that she

was not able and competent to take care of her destitute without coming here to Washington like a mendicant, hat in hand, and asking for what? For a Federal fund? Yes; but a Federal fund acquired first from the taxpayers of Virginia, for the only way the Federal Government can ever get any money into its Treasury is by taxing the people of Virginia and the American people generally.

The administrative officers of Virginia are better able to determine the processes of humanitarian aid to destitute people than is any board that we may constitute here in Washington. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds that have been distributed in my State have been distributed by persons of intimate and expert knowledge of conditions there, by persons who may not be easily imposed upon, by persons who can not be misled by this often exaggerated humanitarian plea. My humanitarian instincts were taken advantage of last week by a fellow who got \$10 of my money—and did not deserve 10 cents of it [laughter]—by telling me that he had his wife and children in an automobile in front of the Senate Office Building and they were without anything to eat, when in fact he had no wife and no children. [Laughter.] That sort of thing could not occur in Virginia in the distribution of Virginia funds that had first been taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers of Virginia and impounded here in the Federal Treasury, to be dispensed either by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or by this additional Federal institution called a board of distribution. So I would be very much obliged to any Senator who could convince me that this is aid to the States rather than a very expensive method of distributing funds first collected from the taxpayers of the States.

Mr. President, I have cast my last vote in the Senate for these temporary expedients providing so-called relief. If I could, I would vote to-morrow to abolish the so-called Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It has not been a reconstruction finance corporation; it has been a "destruction corporation." It has merely deferred the agony, postponed the pay day for all except those States that do not expect to pay this money back, and that will not pay it back. By alarmists we here have been hurried into the passage of measures tendered for curative purposes, but which in the end are proving, and are going to continue to prove, worse than the disease sought to be cured. I am not going to vote for any more of them. I am going to vote first for the proposed amendment, with a suggested modification, of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and then I am going to vote against the whole thing. [Laughter.] So much for the vocal aspects of the case.

I now wish to suggest to the Senator from New York that he has a provision in his amendment and in his proposed substitute which I think is of a very dangerous nature. That is the requirement that these loans of State money back to the States shall bear a rate of interest not exceeding one-half of 1 per cent more than the rate of interest established for the last issue of bonds of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what page is the Senator reading from?

Mr. GLASS. I am reading from page 4 of the substitute, but I have indicated the text of the requirement. That is to say, this money of the States, accumulated here in the Federal Treasury, may be loaned back to the States at a rate of interest not exceeding one-half of 1 per cent above the interest rate established by the last preceding bond issue of the Federal Government.

If we adopt that suggestion, there is not a State nor a community in a State that will issue its own securities to meet the requirements of the State or community. Every township, city, community, and State will come here to borrow money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or from the board proposed by the other bill, rather than to issue its own bonds, because there is not a State or a community that very likely will be able to issue its own securities at as low a rate as this proposed provision would require.

For example, only the other day, in consultation with a gentleman who is soon to assume the office of Chief Magistrate, he sought my judgment as to whether it might be

possible to float a 5-year Federal bond issue at 2½ per cent. I did not think it might be so.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GLASS. Oh, no, no. I am obliged to the Senator, but I do not want to trouble Senators to come here to hear what I have to say. I gave it as my judgment that it would be an exceedingly difficult thing to do, because of the fact that every day we are proposing raids here upon the Federal Treasury. Suggestions are being offered involving the very integrity and honor, as well as the credit, of this Nation.

The mortgage-bond market already has been wrecked, so that no person with funds to invest who is yet outside the lunatic asylum would have so little sense as to invest in mortgage bonds, when the Congress and the legislatures and the governors are assuming the function of declaring moratoriums on credits. The Federal land-bank bonds are to-day at a frightful discount, although they are exempt from taxation; and but for the general misapprehension that these securities are guaranteed by the Federal Government—which is not true—their market value would be infinitely lower to-day than it is. The land banks have not been able to sell one of their bonds now for nearly three years. They could not sell one to-day to save their lives.

For these and a multiplicity of other reasons that might be cited here, I say it is very doubtful whether the Federal Government could issue a 5-year bond at any 2½ per cent interest rate. But, assuming that it could do so, then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in one case and the Federal board of distribution in another case, would loan the funds of the States thus acquired at 3 per cent. Does the Senator from New York imagine that the great metropolis from which he comes could to-morrow float its bonds for 3 per cent?

Mr. WAGNER. It could in normal times.

Mr. GLASS. I am talking about now. I am not talking about normal times. We have not had normal times for 10 years.

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, yes!

Mr. GLASS. No; we have not. We had an era of insane gambling and speculation for 10 years that eventuated in the crash that any man of discernment should have foreseen.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time on the amendment has expired. He has 30 minutes on the bill.

Mr. GLASS. I shall not require that long, Mr. President.

The Senator from New York knows perfectly well that New York City could not float its bonds to-morrow at 3 per cent; and why should it, when it may come here to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and borrow millions of dollars at a lower rate of interest, or come to this humanitarian outfit that is about to be set up?

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. GLASS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. If we had a normal bond market, where issues could be had at the normal rate of 3 or 3½ per cent, we never would have erected the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. GLASS. We never should have erected it.

Mr. WAGNER. That is a difference of opinion. I do not know where we would be without it.

Mr. GLASS. I know where we would be. We would be on the road to recovery in this country if we had never erected the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. WAGNER. After many a tragedy.

Mr. GLASS. Could we have any greater tragedy than we are experiencing right now?

Mr. WAGNER. I think we might have had.

Mr. GLASS. No, Mr. President! We have set a precedent that will return to plague Congress for the next half-century or more. Every contemplated raid on the Federal Treasury, every proposed exhaustion of the taxpayers' funds brought here to Washington has for its excuse now, "You have loaned hundreds of millions of dollars to railroads; you have

loaned other hundreds of millions of dollars to decrepit banks, and there is no reason why you should not loan hundreds of millions of dollars to us." That is the cry, until we are rapidly approaching the point where the credit of this Nation will be impaired, and we will not have any "normal times" for a long time to come.

In setting up this abominable home-loan bank, people talk about homes as if one that was sold under mortgage disappeared from the face of the earth, instead of being bought by some worthy person to live in—some person who exercised great discernment and a greater degree of thrift than the man who procured the mortgage on his home in order that he might ride in an automobile and spend the proceeds of the mortgage for gasoline.

Mr. WAGNER. We are on common ground now.

Mr. GLASS. Building new homes! We had better be able to rent those that we already have. I can not rent mine, and if the Senator has one he can not rent his.

Mr. WAGNER. I have not any.

Mr. GLASS. We talk about railroad receiverships as if when a railroad is put in the hands of a receiver it disappears from the face of the earth; as if the receiver does not have to hire engineers and firemen and brakemen and conductors and trackwalkers and clerks. The only thing he does not have to do is to pay \$150,000 salary to a president. We imagine, it seems, that the railroad disappears physically from the face of the earth when it goes into the hands of a receiver. I will tell the Senator from New York that the only way we are ever going to get a reconstruction, a reorganization of the exaggerated financial set-up of these railroads, is to put some of them, many of them, in the hands of receivers.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the Senator is talking to me as if I were in disagreement with him upon that proposition. I am not a defender of the loans to the railroads; quite the contrary. We are on common ground in the present criticism of the Senator.

Mr. GLASS. I am glad to know that I have the academic sympathy of the Senator from New York; but when it comes to the practical part of it, when it comes to appropriating other millions of dollars—

Mr. WAGNER. To put people to work.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, to put people to work! They are being put to work on the roads in my State, and Virginia is going to pay it back. It is the only State in the Union that has reduced its public indebtedness during this time of depression. Its bonds stand at par in the money market; and I am ashamed of it when it comes up here and borrows \$2,700,000 from this abominable Reconstruction Finance Corporation to put people to work on roads. We have converted every hog path in the State into a hard-surfaced boulevard. [Laughter.]

But to get back to this unhappy proposed provision of the law not permitting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to charge an interest rate in excess of one-half of 1 per cent above that of the latest bond issue of the United States, it is nothing in the world but an engraved invitation to every State and every community in the States to do its borrowing here from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation instead of issuing its own securities and selling them on the open market. Why, even your land banks charge 1 per cent above the rate of their last issue of bonds.

A Senator suggests to me in private conversation that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been charging an excessive rate of interest. Well, if the loans are not going to be paid back, as some Senators suggest, what difference does it make? [Laughter.] I say that if we can not trust the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to deal with this matter in a businesslike as well as in a humanitarian way, then we ought to get another board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; if we do not adopt my saner view of abolishing the whole contraption. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I just want to observe that the statement I made was not my own statement alone. It was also the statement of the Senators from Virginia and Kentucky.

Mr. GLASS. I did not relate the statement to Virginia.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. We do not want to get confused in our statements. The reference of the Senator was to the amount advanced for the relief of the destitute and the needy, which is an entirely different proposition from that with which the Senator is dealing. As to the amounts advanced to relieve destitution and need, the law now fixes the rate of interest at 3 per cent. They could not go beyond that. This deals with advances and loans for public projects needful and in the public interest.

Mr. GLASS. That I know, and any State that is reduced to that degree of penury that it has to come here and ask for a return of a part of the money its taxpayers have paid into the Federal Treasury ought to be required to pay a reasonable interest rate, and the proposed rate would not be a reasonable interest rate. I think that is a reasonable rate which honorable business men, constituted with the serious duty of administering the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, may determine to be in the circumstances the proper interest rate. We may not intelligently determine that here. The board of directors of the corporation must determine that as circumstances warrant it should be determined.

Oh, I look over this list, and see the name of the great State of Pennsylvania, second in population and in wealth, if not first, among all the States of the Union, coming here to Washington to borrow \$26,000,000 of the taxpayers' money from the Federal Treasury to take care of the destitute in that State. I venture to say that there is not a respectable community in the United States with any humanitarian spirit whatsoever that is unable to take care of its destitute, not one. The great State of New York is modest beyond compare when contrasted with Pennsylvania; it borrows \$6,000,000. Where do we get the \$26,000,000 and the \$6,000,000? We take it out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the State of the Senator from New York more largely than from the taxpayers of any other State, because the taxpayers of his State have taken it out of the pockets of all the people of the country put together.

I hope the Senator will regard my suggestion with some degree of toleration that this provision of the bill ought to be stricken out, and that we should continue to confide to the business as well as to the humanitarian instincts of the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the duty of lending this money at a reasonable rate of interest, as the circumstances may determine.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have exhausted my time. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I shall not agree to a proposal to strike out the section altogether unless the Senate insists upon that procedure. I am quite willing, however, to extend the spread from one-half of 1 per cent to 1 per cent, which would, under present circumstances, bring the rate up to 4 per cent. Of course, the Senator does not believe in the philosophy of this whole proposition of permitting municipalities and States—

Mr. GLASS. I do not think it has any philosophy. The Senator means the fancy of it.

Mr. WAGNER. No; I do not. I think it is the only way we have now available to put people back to work, and to start on our road to recovery. No one has suggested an alternative. But the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has operated its functions as an ultraconservative business institution, looking for large profits, instead of charging a fair rate of interest above that which they pay for the money, so that the municipalities may get the money at a rate which the municipalities in normal times could secure in the open market. Instead of that, they have made it impossible for these municipalities to accept the loans because of the high rate of interest imposed, 5½ and 6 per cent,

which is 2 to 3 per cent more than the municipalities are required to pay in the open market in normal times.

We created this instrumentality to take the place of sources of aid in normal times, to help the communities to further their projects, to put people to work, in order to help in this difficult situation, to give people employment rather than charity. I think the country is in favor of that policy, irrespective of the opinion of the Senator from Virginia, from whom I rarely differ.

Mr. GLASS. I do not think the country knows anything about it, and I have come to the conclusion that we knew so little about it as that we permitted ourselves to be rushed off of our feet to adopt all of these psychological expedients or, as I once called them, psychological poultices.

I recall that the State of South Carolina, which has maintained its financial integrity and credit for years, was unable to float an issue of \$500,000 of 5 per cent bonds for constructive purposes in that State in 1929. Yet here now it is proposed that we invite South Carolina, and States and communities similarly situated, to come to Washington and borrow back the money which they have paid into the Federal Treasury at one-half of 1 per cent more than the next succeeding bond issue, whatever that may be.

Mr. WAGNER. Prior bond issue.

Mr. GLASS. Yes; prior to this loan. That is the next succeeding bond issue, unless the distinguished Senator from New York imagines that the Federal Government can go on paying out millions upon millions of dollars without engaging in another bond issue.

Mr. WAGNER. I think these enterprises, if they are inaugurated, will so stimulate business, so prime the pump, that there will be no difficulty in collecting taxes. I do not want to interrupt the Senator any further—

Mr. GLASS. I have about concluded. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. WAGNER. I want to say this, that witnesses appeared before our committee from all over the country, and they had a list of interest charges in normal times to municipalities and to some States on money borrowed to finance their own projects, and in many cases the rates were below 3 per cent, and were rarely ever above 4 per cent. If the language here is changed to read "1 per cent above the interest rate of the last bond issue," we will permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to charge 4 per cent for loans, which is as high as it ought to go.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I am in favor either of discharging the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or permitting them to exercise their business judgment upon these loans as circumstances require, and I think they can do it a long way more intelligently than we can.

Talk about normal times! Have we done normal things under the administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? Sixty-five million dollars of the taxpayers' money has been loaned to build a concrete bridge across San Francisco Bay, and millions upon millions of dollars for projects of that kind. The people from my State have come here to get my influence—which I do not possess—to have bridges built across the James River, and the York River, and the Potomac River.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, would the Senator stop all progress?

Mr. GLASS. No; but I would stop all raids on the Federal Treasury if I could.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. May I ask the Senator, who has had long experience in banking, if he has reached any estimate as to the number of securities the Federal Government will be able to sell?

Mr. GLASS. If we keep on at the present rate, it will not be able to sell any.

Mr. COUZENS. Is there any limit, in the Senator's mind, as to what we might be able to sell?

Mr. GLASS. I understand we will have to fund \$600,000,000 of bonds by the 15th day of March. I do not know at what

rate of interest that may be done. We will have in a brief period of time to fund \$6,000,000,000 of maturing Government bonds. I do not know at what rate that may be done. We will have in the not very distant future to fund \$11,000,000,000 of Government bonds, and if we keep on raiding the Federal Treasury—

Mr. COUZENS. We have now outstanding, in all forms of securities, nearly \$21,000,000,000.

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. COUZENS. Does the Senator believe we could continue to extend that amount until we reached \$35,000,000,000?

Mr. GLASS. Perhaps so, unless we are to adopt some of the suggestions that have been presented here. Undertake a devaluation of the gold dollar by curtailing its grain content 30 per cent, and I do not think we would be able to sell another Federal bond at any rate of interest. Undertake by legislation to dishonor this Nation, to say that the requirements denominated in the bonds—\$21,000,000,000 of them outstanding—shall not be complied with; undertake to assume authority as has been suggested may be done, to vitiate millions of business contracts that have the gold payment denominated in the bond, mortgage, and other bonds, and the Federal Government will not be able to sell anything, but, on the contrary, there will not be enough free gold left in this country with which to do the dentistry work. In 60 days we would wipe out our Treasury gold reserve, and would wipe out the gold reserve of the banks.

There are in process now demands for redemption. In one great city on last Friday \$3,000,000 of currency, paper promises to pay, were exchanged for gold for the strong boxes, and the following day a greater sum, and if we keep on at this rate God only knows how long the credit of the Federal Government may be maintained.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GLASS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator states that breaking up private contracts would lead toward this terrible result he mentions. Did we not break up many private contracts in 1920 and 1921, when fares were fixed by contract and rates were fixed by contract, thousands and probably hundreds of thousands of them, and because the dollar was worth only 60 cents, did not the Supreme Court of the United States say they had to yield to regulation, and did it not strike them all out? What is the difference now, when the dollar is worth \$1.66, if regulation does the same thing?

Mr. GLASS. I observe a great deal of difference. I am not to be drawn off into this hypothetical discussion. The Senator from Michigan, who is a practical business man, asked me a common-sense question and I tried to give him a common-sense answer.

Mr. LONG. I do not suppose the Supreme Court's answer was any good in 1920. I do not suppose the Supreme Court's answer in 1921 was common sense, but they did what I have stated.

Mr. GLASS. Well, I have known some people to question the common sense of the Supreme Court, and I do not believe the Supreme Court has ever rendered any decision that resulted in the vitiation of a contract, because they could not constitutionally do it. But happily I am not a constitutional lawyer.

But again I appeal to the Senator from New York to leave the determination of practical matters like this to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, should his substitute prevail, and to the business instinct of the proposed new corporation should the Costigan-La Follette proposal prevail, because they can better determine the matter than we may do here. That is all I have to say.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not want to be obstinate about any provision—

Mr. GLASS. I know none of us ever is.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not want to be, except that all of the efforts of Congress to bring about a large program of municipal and public works have been frustrated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in charging what I regard under present conditions as exorbitant rates of interest.

It was in order to control that by at least fixing a maximum that I put that provision in the bill. If the Senator feels that a restriction ought not to be placed upon the loans and it ought to be left to the discretion of the board, I shall not complain one way or the other.

Mr. GLASS. I am glad to have that assurance from the Senator. As a matter of fact when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans \$65,000,000 to build a bridge, I think they ought to get a pretty stiff rate of interest on a loan of that sort, and on loans for many of the other projected public works.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. GLASS. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. The trouble is that we do not know what kind of a rate of interest they will charge, whether it may be small or what. It seems to me a tremendous power to give these people.

Mr. GLASS. The fact that they have not charged a lower rate of interest than that proposed prompts my suggestion. As a matter of fact the complaint of the Senator from New York and those who inspired this suggestion is that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has charged a rate of interest which will give some slight assurance that it is not going to lose the taxpayers' money. The Senator from New York talks about conducting the business with an eye to profit. I would like to contribute to a fund to buy a microscope powerful enough to discover any profit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will ever get out of the business.

Mr. BORAH. I quite agree with the Senator in that respect. I think a large amount of the debate that has been going on for the last day or two on this question as between the two propositions is not very conclusive, for the reason, whether we adopt the one plan or the other, we are not going to get this money back, in all probability.

Mr. GLASS. I am not prepared to dispute that. Pride of State makes me believe and here declare that the Federal Government will get back Virginia's loan. If not, I shall be much more ashamed of her than I ever expect to be.

Mr. BORAH. Where is the pride of a great State which comes down here and asks a loan of \$26,000,000?

Mr. GLASS. There is not any. That is what I complain of. We have wiped out all State pride in this country and become a nation of mendicants.

Mr. BORAH. Where is pride of State when the great bankers come down here and ask the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan a railroad company \$24,000,000?

Mr. GLASS. What has become of the sanity of the administrators of the railroads when they come here and ask us to make loans to the railroads without any collateral security at all? It reminds me of an episode in my own life, when I was addressing the Chicago Association of Commerce in 1914. My companion on the rostrum was Private John Allen, of Mississippi. He told the assembled audience that he had been induced to come there for two reasons only. One was to correct a painful impression that had gotten abroad; that as he was approaching Tupelo a few days theretofore a stranger approached him and asked him the name of the town and he told him. He said, "Yes; Tupelo. That is where John Allen used to live. Poor old fellow; he is dead now." Private John Allen wanted to correct that impression.

Then he said; "I wanted to meet the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives face to face and insist to him that the Federal reserve act should be so modified as to permit a man to borrow money from a bank without collateral and, if the bank insisted upon collateral, to declare in the statute that the borrower should be the judge of his own collateral." [Laughter.]

The railroads are now taking that view, that they should be loaned the taxpayers' money without any collateral whatsoever. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr.

COUZENS] who now rises to his feet, has reported to us that upon his examination he finds that the collateral already lodged is inadequate for its purposes.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GLASS. Certainly.

Mr. COUZENS. Will the Senator from Virginia support an amendment to the pending bill to repeal the provision of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act which permits it to loan to railroads?

Mr. GLASS. I will.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GLASS. I am glad of it! [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] to the Wagner amendment, which will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place insert the following:

SEC. —. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to make loans, in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$25,000,000, under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, as amended, to any public or private hospital organized under the laws of any State upon the same terms and conditions and subject to the same limitations as are applicable in the case of loans to financial institutions specified in section 5 of such act, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is upon the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] as amended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 25, after the so-called Wagner amendment, insert the following proviso:

Provided, That this act shall be construed to permit the governor of any State to use, under supervision of the State highway department, such loan in the improvement of highways as a part of his work-relief plan.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WAGNER. I understand the amendment now pending is in the nature of a substitute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the original amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to the amendment of the committee, which was reconsidered.

Mr. WAGNER. I would suggest to the Senator from Arizona that I do not deal with the subject that he desires to amend in the original amendment which I have offered. That will come subsequently, when I offer the substitute.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well; I withdraw the amendment for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, then, is on the amendment of the Senator from New York as amended.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The provision which has just been discussed by the Senator from Virginia is that to which the amendment relates. The amendment which I now offer is to strike out the matter to which the Senator from Virginia has objected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Ohio proposes in title 2 of the so-called Wagner amendment, page 4, lines 15 to 21, both inclusive, to strike out the following:

Provided further, That each loan made under paragraphs (1) to (5) of subsection (a) of this section after this subsection, as amended, takes effect, shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding one-half of 1 per cent more than the rate of interest established for the last issue of bonds of the United States preceding the making of such loan.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator's amendment propose to strike out of the bill that part which limits the rate of interest that may be charged to one-half of 1 per cent

over the rate of interest on the last issue of Government bonds?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. LONG. May I ask the Senator if that is his amendment?

Mr. BULKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. I certainly hope the amendment will not be adopted. I hope the Senator is not serious in offering the amendment. The Senator from New York proposed to increase the rate of interest to 1 per cent above that obtained on the last issue of bonds, but I was hoping that he would not do that. That would not be particularly objectionable, however.

Mr. WAGNER. May I suggest that if the amendment is defeated I had intended to offer an amendment extending the rate from one-half of 1 per cent to 1 per cent above that borne by the last bond issue.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, would not the Senator from New York prefer to perfect his amendment before the vote is taken on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LONG. I hope that will be done.

Mr. BULKLEY. I have no objection to that procedure if I do not lose the opportunity to offer my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio withdraws his amendment temporarily. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I move that the amendment which I have offered may be again amended, on page 4, line 19, by striking out the words "one-half of." That would leave the rate at 1 per cent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York to his original amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BULKLEY. I now offer the amendment to strike out the proviso to which my amendment relates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let it be again reported.

The Chief Clerk again stated the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not suppose it is necessary, but the Senator from New York has amended his amendment so that the rate of interest to be borne by the Government on loans made to the States is 1 per cent more than the Government pays for the money. What the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would do would be simply to leave it to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to fix its own rate of interest. That might be 10 per cent for Maine, 3 per cent for Virginia, 12 per cent for Michigan, or any rate they want to fix. I think this ought to be a standard rate, and a reasonable rate. One per cent over the amount the Government itself pays for the money, if we are going to lend money, is sufficiently high.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the amendment.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] the purpose of section 28, on page 5, where \$5,000,000 is made available for establishing credit insurance organizations or for their benefit. Why is that necessary in this bill?

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, representatives of some of the insurance organizations came before the committee and said that at the present time, because of the condition of the market, they were unable to secure insurance to insure the payment of credits upon our exports. They urge that for a temporary time they thought the Government ought to include that particular line.

Mr. DICKINSON. Why should the Government assume that responsibility?

Mr. WAGNER. For the same reason that we are aiding banks and other financial institutions and helping to finance agricultural exports at present through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We are doing the same thing for

surplus agricultural products; they are being financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. DICKINSON. It is my impression that this provision merely provides additional funds whereby there may be paid premiums for certain insurance organizations that otherwise might not be able to carry on certain types of insurance business. I see no real reason why this provision should be in the bill.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not think the Senator's criticism is justified.

Mr. DICKINSON. What security do they put up for this money?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. They are required to give adequate security.

Mr. WAGNER. There is a general provision of the law which requires adequate security for all loans. I tried to make it plain on several occasions that there is an omnibus provision in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act that no loan shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation except upon adequate security; so that, whatever the nature of the loan is, it must be adequately secured or it can not be granted.

Mr. DICKINSON. The provision reads:

for the purpose of enabling and assisting established credit insurance organizations in the United States to provide export credit guaranties upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon—

It would look as though these organizations are to be paid for a special service.

Mr. WAGNER. It is a loan like other loans, I may say to the Senator. Whether he agrees to that particular policy or whether the Senate agrees is another proposition, but the loans can not be granted except adequate security is given to the Government. The idea was to encourage the export of our commodities. That is the explanation which was made before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York whether it is his purpose to incorporate in the amendment in the nature of a substitute he is about to offer the amendments which were agreed to on Saturday—to the amendment which has just been adopted to the pending bill?

Mr. WAGNER. It is.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The reason why I asked the question is that my colleague [Mr. BLAINE], who is detained to-day because of critical illness in his family, offered an amendment on Saturday to the amendment which has just been adopted, and he is not here to offer it at this time to the Senator's amendment in the nature of a substitute. I wondered whether the Senator intended to incorporate in the substitute all the amendments which have been adopted to his amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I was going to ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I am about to offer in the nature of a substitute may be so modified as to embrace all the amendments which have been adopted to the amendment just agreed to. In that form I now offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute. Do I make myself clear?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not quite get what the Senator desires.

Mr. WAGNER. I have a few moments' time, and I shall prepare the amendment as proposed to be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I wish to make a motion to strike from the proposed substitute all of section 14 on page 8, beginning in line 17. That was the amendment that was just discussed by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON]. I make the motion that that section, embracing

subsection (k), may be eliminated from the bill. It reads as follows:

SEC. 14. Section 201 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make available out of the funds of the corporation a sum not exceeding \$5,000,000, which may be used by the corporation for the purpose of enabling and assisting established credit insurance organizations in the United States to provide export credit guaranties upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the corporation and such credit insurance organizations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEIWER. Is an amendment now in order to the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to that amendment is now in order.

Mr. STEIWER. I send to the desk, then, the following amendment and ask that it may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New York.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Oregon offers the following amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

At the proper place it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE III—ADVANCES TO RECLAMATION FUND

SEC. —. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, upon request of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized and empowered to advance from funds made available by section 2 of the act of January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. L. 5), to the reclamation fund created by the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. 388), such sum or sums as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary for the completion of projects or divisions of projects now under construction. Funds so advanced shall be repaid out of any receipts and accretions accruing to the reclamation fund within such time as may be fixed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, not exceeding five years from the date of advance, with interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum. Sums so advanced may be expended in the same way as other moneys in the reclamation fund.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief explanation of this proposal. The language of the amendment which I have offered is identical with Senate bill 5607, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. That bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, from which the Wagner relief bill also comes. The Committee on Banking and Currency authorized a favorable report upon the bill, and that favorable report was made earlier to-day. So the proposal is now before the Senate with a favorable report of the committee.

The object, and the only object, of this proposal is to enable the Reclamation Service to complete projects which are presently under construction. The amendment submitted by me does not involve any additional project or any change in policy or any extension of the reclamation program. Every project for which relief is contemplated under this amendment is a project already authorized by law; every project, with some slight exceptions, which would be benefited by this proposal is a project for which there is a contract presently existing for the construction of the works.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

Mr. STEIWER. I will yield in just a moment. Every project for which relief is contemplated under this proposal is a project for which an estimate has already been made by the Interior Department and for which an estimate has already been submitted, in many cases, to the Bureau of the Budget, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget; and in very many cases all the items that would be included in the loans contemplated by this amendment are items which are covered by the Department of Interior ap-

appropriation bill, which was recently passed by the Senate and which, as I understand, is now a law.

The only reason why it is necessary to offer this amendment at this time is that the appropriations made by the Congress for the construction of the reclamation projects are made from a special fund. If they were made from the general fund, of course, the money would be taken out of the Treasury, and it would now be available for the Reclamation Service, but because those appropriations are made from a special revolving fund, they are available only in the event that money is in the special fund at the time it is required.

By the moratorium bill which Congress enacted during the last session the revenues that normally go into that special fund have been very greatly curtailed, and the Reclamation Bureau finds itself at this time in this situation: They have projects authorized and under construction, with contracts made and with appropriations approved by the Bureau of the Budget and actually made by the Congress of the United States, but still the bureau is not able to keep faith in meeting the obligations under its own contracts.

This amendment, Mr. President, would be one form of loan that would be repaid. If the Congress should see fit to add the amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from New York, we would be creating one class of loans that would be repaid, because they would constitute preferred claims in a moral sense at least, against the reclamation fund; and those in charge of that fund would be able, under any kind of conditions, even under the conditions of this day, to guarantee the return of these loans. Now I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I was going to suggest to the Senator that, of course, the committee has had no chance to study the proposal of the Senator, nor have I, as the sponsor of the legislation, had such an opportunity; and the amendment is brought in now at the last moment, when it seems to me it is rather late to incorporate it in the legislation which is pending. I think at least the committee ought to have an opportunity to study the proposed amendment and its effect. If it is merely to supplement an appropriation already made, it ought to be proposed, it seems to me, in the form of separate legislation and not be made a part of the pending bill. It does not seem to me to be pertinent to the subject matter with which we are dealing.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

Mr. STEIWER. I will defer replying to the Senator from New York for just a moment until I have yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator's explanation, the money that he proposes to have advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in anticipation of an appropriation later to be received from the Government?

Mr. STEIWER. The appropriation has been made in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill of this year.

Mr. COUZENS. Why is it not available?

Mr. STEIWER. It is not available because it is an appropriation out of the special revolving fund. The appropriations for the Reclamation Service are not made, as Senators know, from the general funds of the Treasury, but are made from a special revolving fund. There is no money in that fund at this time sufficient in amount to enable the United States to keep its obligations under its own contracts.

Mr. COUZENS. What will replenish the fund of the Reclamation Service which has now been exhausted?

Mr. STEIWER. That special revolving fund will be replenished by repayments by settlers, by oil royalties, and by the proceeds of the sale of public lands.

Mr. COUZENS. Has the Senator any estimate of the amount involved or does the bill of which the amendment is a copy, state the sum?

Mr. STEIWER. The bill does not state the amount in express terms, but the Interior Department estimates that it will require about \$5,000,000.

Mr. COUZENS. In other words, in spite of the depressed condition of industry and all that, the Senator contemplates that the reclamation fund will be sufficiently replenished so as to enable repayment to be made to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the loans which it may advance?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes; that is contemplated. Of course the Reclamation Bureau would be obliged to take out of their revenues a sufficient amount to pay this obligation.

Mr. COUZENS. Yes; but I understand that the basic principle is that the reclamation fund will be built up through collections from people who are already unable to pay.

Mr. STEIWER. Oh, no, Mr. President. Even under present conditions, as the economic situation now exists, we have been receiving substantial sums into the reclamation fund. They come from sales of public lands, from oil royalties, and partly from the payments made by settlers. I have no doubt that the settlers on many of the projects of this country could have kept up their payments, which are small on the part of each individual settler; but Congress itself, by the moratorium bill agreed to in the last Congress, has extended deferments in payment; and by our own action we have robbed that fund of its normal income.

Let me say, in further answer, that the total amount in the revolving fund of the Reclamation Bureau, subject, of course, to certain write-offs for losses, is something like \$160,000,000. In the old days \$20,000,000 was appropriated for a loan to that fund. Of that \$20,000,000 substantially \$10,000,000 was repaid; and then two years ago, I believe, Congress authorized a further loan of \$5,000,000 from the Treasury to the reclamation fund. So at this time the obligation of the reclamation fund to the Treasury is substantially, if not exactly, \$15,000,000.

This proposal does not take the money out of the Treasury. It takes it from the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for the first time in history, I believe, would require interest to be paid by the Reclamation Bureau upon the Federal money so advanced.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. As I understand the situation, Congress last year passed an act extending the time when these payments by settlers and these other resources would be available. How long does that extension last?

Mr. STEIWER. I think the repayments under the bill of last year start either this year or in 1934. I am not sure whether it falls in the fiscal year or the calendar year, so I can not answer exactly.

Mr. FLETCHER. So what the Senator calls a moratorium expires next year probably?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. In the meantime there would be no funds coming into that special fund?

Mr. STEIWER. Such little funds as come from oil royalties and the sale of public lands, of course, are coming in at all times.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator's amendment require that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation must look to that special fund for a return of the money that they advance?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes. It also provides that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall prescribe the time for the repayment of the money.

Mr. FLETCHER. We do not want to pay twice. We do not want to make another donation to the fund.

Mr. STEIWER. This proposal comes from the Interior Department. I understand that the Senator from Utah introduced the bill S. 5601 upon the urgent insistence of the Interior Department that unless this loan could be made they would be obliged to default in their contracts, and I want the Senate to know what that means. It means, in the first place, that the contractors would have claims against the United States on account of the breach by the

United States Government. It means, above that, that those who are employed, and who number more than 2,000, would be thrown into the unemployed out in desert countries where there is no work for anybody and little chance for relief. It means, still above that, that something like 10,000 settlers who have moved on the projects in reliance upon the faith of the United States Government, and who have been taught to believe that waters would be delivered to them either this summer or the summer to come, would find themselves upon arid land with no water, with no hope of water, and they would be in just as serious a condition as those who are now the employees of the contractors; and distress would be brought to all of them. Why? Because the Federal Government had failed to keep its own obligations under its own agreements!

In order to avoid that kind of a situation the Senator from Utah brought the bill here, and to further the purpose I have offered it as an amendment to the substitute proposal of the Senator from New York.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether the bill to which he has referred has been reported by the committee?

Mr. STEIWER. It has. It was reported earlier to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But just to-day?

Mr. STEIWER. To-day. It is not yet on the calendar. It will be on the calendar to-morrow.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I point out to the Senator that there are a large number of additional methods for approaching the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for funds, including flood control and other processes of reclamation. That is particularly true of drainage areas; and I doubt whether we ought to incorporate this provision in the bill.

Mr. STEIWER. May I ask the Senator a question? Are there other situations in which the United States Government has made contracts and where the circumstances indicate that the Government is going to be obliged to breach its own agreements, as is the case with respect to the contracts executed by the Reclamation Bureau?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not know of cases where the Government has actually made contracts and where the funds are not available; but what I can not understand is why the Government should make contracts for the construction of reclamation projects without having the amounts available in the reclamation fund.

Mr. STEIWER. I am told that the Reclamation Bureau limits its contracts to an amount for which the anticipations of last year seemed to afford a basis of perfect safety, and, of course, the contracts are within the appropriations. The curtailment in receipts, partly brought on by the action of the Congress itself in providing for the moratorium of last year, has depleted the special fund, so that the required funds are not available.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Of course everyone who suggested or advocated the moratorium as to reclamation payments knew that that would be the effect of reducing temporarily the fund available for reclamation projects; and they knew that it would be necessary to go to the Treasury or obtain funds in some indirect way. There are a great many applications here for funds for different purposes that are not comprehended within the provisions of this bill for reclamation projects; and I think we had better give this subject separate treatment, if I may make that suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. STEIWER. I know of no other application which could come from an agency of the United States and which might be prompted by the action of Congress itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, some time ago I offered an amendment which was not in order. I believe it now is in order, and I should like to have it stated again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Arizona offers the following amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

After the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], inserted on page 2, line 25, of the so-called Wagner amendment, insert:

Provided, That this act shall be construed to permit the governor of a State to use, under supervision of the State highway department, such loan in the improvement of highways as a part of his work-relief plan.

Mr. WAGNER. There is no objection to that, Mr. President.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia permits money borrowed by States from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be expended for supervision and overhead expenses upon the approval of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There has been a tendency in some States for road work to be done by the governors, without utilizing the services and the experience of the State highway departments, thereby building up what amounts to rival road construction organizations. Any road work that is done by a State should be carried on under the supervision of its State highway department. The amendment will also permit money thus borrowed to be expended to supplement Federal aid to highways, which is perfectly proper, particularly since Congress has failed to authorize future Federal aid road appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments which were adopted by the Senate to the amendment offered by me, which amendment has been adopted by the Senate, be incorporated in the amendment I have offered in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I rise to inquire whether or not the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has offered his amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has. It is pending now.

Mr. DICKINSON. I move to strike out all of section 6, beginning on line 15 of page 3, and ending with line 3 of page 5.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the effect of that is simply to strike out the authorization for the expenditure of \$15,000,000 to take care of transients.

Mr. LONG. That certainly ought to stay in.

Mr. WAGNER. It has been discussed so much in the Senate already that we all understand the problem, so that I shall not spend any further time upon it. It would be most unfortunate if that provision were stricken from the bill.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, in my judgment we are simply proceeding here to encourage people to become transients rather than to discourage them. We are setting up here a fund of \$15,000,000 to be borrowed by the governors of the various States, and they are going to furnish relief and work relief to unemployed and needy transients and to aid in their rehabilitation in training in work camps, which means, if you please, that we are going to be establishing work camps all over the United States with the purpose of taking care of this type of transients.

I know of nothing that will be as much of a contributing factor to the hobo class in this country as this type of provision. We have already taken care of numerous boys under the Couzens amendment to the Army bill. Now we are seeking to extend that, if you please, to the point of inviting

the people of various sections to become transients, and saying, "If you will move from this State to another State, there they are putting in work camps and rehabilitation camps; and all you have to do is to go there and make application, and you will then be a transient, and will be cared for by the Government at Government expense."

To me this is a provision that is headed exactly in the wrong direction. On the other hand, if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has a request from a governor of a State to assist in caring for their poor, that can be done. The transient, when he comes in for a meal of victuals, is not asked whether he is a resident of New York or not; but here we say to him, "Become a transient, and we are going to set up training camps for you. We are going to set up rehabilitation camps for you."

Mr. WAGNER and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the evidence adduced in a survey recently made shows that there are over a million and a quarter of men, women, and children wandering around this country homeless, looking for an economic opportunity which in most communities is foreclosed. Most of these people have left their homes because there was no possibility of employment in their own localities. They can not get any work in their States of residence, and therefore they wander to some other section in the hope of securing employment. When they reach their destination they find local restrictive legislation which provides that one must be a resident of that particular locality for a year or two years before one is entitled to any relief or employment. Thus the wanderer is hopeless again; and unless some generous person gives him something to eat, or gives him shelter, he is absolutely abandoned.

It is to take care of that type of case that this provision is made. We are not inviting anybody to go anywhere. These people are all over the country now, a million and a quarter of them. They would not be migrating except that there is no chance for them to work at the places where they formerly lived. By the bill before us we are dealing with this problem, I think, much more intelligently than by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] because, while it is true that his amendment helps to arrest the process of mental and moral deterioration by putting the young people into a wholesome atmosphere and giving them exercise, there is no provision for training them or providing employment for them.

That is why I think this method of dealing with the subject, for which I am indebted to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CURTING], who was the one who proposed the remedy first, is the best way of approaching it. We permit the States to deal with it, to provide camps or other methods of rehabilitating these people, so as to give them employment, and care for their physical needs. I think it would be very unfortunate if this provision were eliminated from the bill and these unfortunate people were left wandering without aid.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, the author of the amendment himself implies that they are going to do exactly the thing I contend they will do. If a man and his family, residents of the State of Illinois, find that they are out of work, and the Governor of the State of Ohio has set up one of these rehabilitation camps, all they have to do is to put their furniture in the old Ford and drive over to the State of Ohio and go into that camp. Instead of keeping the people where they have their residence, where they should stay—because, dear knows, they can always get along better in the localities where they have friends and acquaintances than in a strange locality—it will lead them to wander over the country, and that is the thing we do not want them to do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. This provision is not intended for the benefit of people who have a residence. It is intended for those who have no residence, people who are wanderers, who are moving about from one community to another, and who are kept moving by reason of the fact that there is no provision in the locality where they happen to be quartered. In other words, the States limit their relief out of the funds that are obtained from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to their own citizens, or residents of the State, and a person who happens to be in Iowa who is not a citizen of the State of Iowa or not a resident of the State, and not, therefore, entitled to relief or assistance under the State administration, has to move on to another State and receive assistance there for two or three days, and continue the movement. The object of this provision, as I understand it, is to avoid that necessity.

Mr. DICKINSON. As a matter of fact, there is not a large number of people in the United States who have no set place of residence.

Mr. JOHNSON. O Mr. President!

Mr. DICKINSON. If there is a transient group, we ought to insist that they get a place of residence.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think the Senator from Iowa had better check up on that statement before he makes it again.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. As to boys, the testimony shows that more than a quarter of a million of them are wandering around the country to-day. The testimony shows, as to those who are not boys, that there are more than a million and a quarter wandering around this country to-day.

Mr. DICKINSON. The Senator does not meet my reply. The fact is that most of those people have residences in some State, and if they are told to go home to the place where they have a residence they can go home.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment more?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Tell them to go home! Let us think of that for a moment. Across the line into California during a considerable period of time there came 1,200 per day of homeless people. Our State undertook to establish camps for the relief of those people. Those camps, of course, could take care of only a small portion of those needing aid, and they have taken care of about 5,000 in State-organized and State-supervised camps, where it was sought to relieve distress.

I beg pardon for interfering with the Senator's time. If he will pardon me, I want to continue for an instant. Or would he wish me to conclude?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am glad to extend the Senator's time.

Mr. JOHNSON. Let me say to the Senator this as well: It is not a question of saying to these people, who thus come across the line, "You go home." For the love of God, where will they go? They are there because they have not anything, because they have traveled and traveled and traveled in the hope that they might accomplish something, or that they might get work. We can not turn them around, in a little, broken-down old car, in which they have come, or when they have tramped across the line of our State, and say to them, "Go back to Iowa"—and many of them have come from the State of Iowa. They have nothing in Iowa, and they have nothing in California except the relief which the State and the relief societies may have given them.

The other day, through an amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], we undertook to take care of a maximum, if they are taken into the Army camps, of 88,000 boys. If there remain in this country a couple of hundred thousand youths who have no place to go, who are transients, it seems to me that every element, not only of

pity and mercy but every element that exists in a human constitution, ought to lead us to take care of those who thus require it.

I submit to the Senator that, if he will look at the testimony that has been taken in this matter before the various committees, he will see not only the fact that this is desirable, but he will see that it is absolutely essential if we are to deal with humanity at all by legislation.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I am familiar with the type of family who put their belongings in the Ford and start from one State to another. We have charitable organizations in every State, and I know those people are cared for in many instances by charitable organizations. It is not a question of taking care of them for a day or two, or anything of that kind, but here it is said we are to establish rehabilitation camps, and are to have work camps, and are to build up an organization that is to be utilized by this type of inhabitants.

The theory that these people have no established residence in any State is in my judgment wrong. Most of them have a home somewhere. They have come from somewhere, and they have come probably thinking they are going to better their condition, and the quicker we discourage that type of transient in the United States, the better we will be off.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, with due respect for the conclusions of the Senator from Iowa, I do not agree with him. Without intending to use offensive language, to say to a man in these days "Go home," is equivalent to telling him to go to Hades. Many of those for whom this provision is sought to be made have no homes. Their homes were shattered before they started out upon the road.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the Wagner substitute. Consider the conditions: The head of the house lost his job, his position, the home was mortgaged, and the mortgage was foreclosed. The elder son, probably all the sons, left school, and the daughters likewise, hoping to secure work to aid the parents. Weary, embarrassed, and out of sheer self-respect, they left their native village, their native county or State, to go forth as our fathers did in other but happier days, to try to carve from the granite face of fate a livelihood for themselves and for those left at home.

Unable to secure employment, they have for months tramped the highways and the streets, and many men with antecedents just as worthy as the antecedents of any Senator here have been reduced to a position where they have almost lost their own self-respect.

For them it is no longer a matter of securing a "job," no longer a matter of securing a position; it is a matter of securing clothing; it is a matter of securing sufficient food to enable them to continue an animal existence.

There has come with this calamitous depression, and naturally comes, a loss of ideals, an evaporation of hope, far more baleful and tragic than the mere loss of money, or even the loss of the home.

They have no home to which they may go. The distress at the home village would only be emphasized and increased if they went "home." They would, forsooth, go back in rags, hungry, in many instances covered with vermin, and be obliged to confess to their already stricken relatives and friends at "home" that they have not been able to earn a dollar during their long wanderings to send back to the old home.

Mr. President, only the most desperate emergency would call for legislation of this sort, but a desperate emergency is upon us. It is worse than war. In war time the national banner floats bravely in the sky, the speeches of the orators encourage and stimulate men and women, and the heroic voice of silver bugles calls them forth. But in circumstances such as those now upon us, men must take courage only from the reservoirs of their own souls. Men receive no encouragement from the orators or from the bugles. There is no romance, no glamour; all is drab, dull, and hopeless. Each man thus tramping has a body of death chained to himself. Each man has a sad soul, and his heart is an aching, lumpish thing. Each man thus wandering almost

wishes he could separate himself from an existence here if this condition is to be continued.

Therefore I say, Mr. President, it is an emergency greater than war; it is a distress more poignant than any war; and I support the provision now pending. With due deference, I oppose the amendment of my learned friend from Iowa; but I ask the Senator from New York, whose benevolence and whose ability shine throughout this country and whose leadership will be followed and ought to be followed, in my judgment, to accept an amendment by which I propose, on page 3, line 22, after the word "transients" to insert the words "who are American citizens."

Mr. President, my reason for offering this amendment is: We of the Southwest have an international line of nearly 2,000 miles. Aliens in vast numbers are bootlegged across that line, and it is more than our respective States may do to feed and care for our own people. But, whether or not my amendment shall be adopted, I shall support the provision offered by the Senator from New York, and it would be helpful if the amendment I have offered could be added so that this sort of relief shall be furnished only to American citizens. I ask that my amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That amendment may not be offered at this time, since there is an amendment pending. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. CUTTING obtained the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just about two minutes?

Mr. CUTTING. We will have until only 4.30 o'clock, and I know there are a number of other Senators who want to speak on the pending amendment and on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] has spoken of charitable organizations. It is quite obvious that the Senator has not read the hearings on the measure originally introduced by me, which has been incorporated in the La Follette-Costigan bill. I may say that a similar measure is contained in the Wagner substitute.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. While the Senator was out of the Chamber, in my short observation on the amendment I have offered I told of my indebtedness to the Senator from New Mexico for this particular provision of the measure.

Mr. CUTTING. I thank the Senator.

What I particularly want to bring to the attention of the Senate is that in most cases local charitable organizations and municipal and State charity organizations have a regulation throughout the country that they can not take care of any except the citizens of the State. The transients are either not being taken care of at all or they are being given one night's lodging and sent on their way. A very interesting questionnaire was sent out to the mayors of many of the cities of the country. I am going to ask that the answers of the mayors may be incorporated at the end of my remarks, because I think they answer very briefly and pointedly the complaint of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit A.)

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. Does the Senator realize that every mayor would like to get the responsibility of taking care of the people who happen to be within the borders of his city transferred to the Federal Government rather than to have the responsibility rest on his own city?

Mr. CUTTING. The questionnaire was an entirely different one from what the Senator implies. The mayors were not asked whether or not they wanted any aid from the Federal Government. What they were asked was: "What are you doing to take care of transients?" Let me read a few answers from the mayors of some towns in the Senator's own State:

Oskaloosa: Sleep at police station; work on woodpile.
 Cherokee: Do nothing.
 Mason City: Fed and lodged overnight only.
 Bettendorf: One meal and flop and on your way.
 Nevada: Feed in return for work on woodpile.
 Independence: Free lodging only.
 Cresco: One meal and one night's lodging.
 Ottumwa: Referred to soup kitchen for a meal and then on their way elsewhere.
 Glenwood: Lodging and breakfast once only.

I am not singling out the State of Iowa because it is particularly negligent in the handling of this problem. Every State in the United States has a record of the same kind, from East to West. These young men and aging men and young women are given one night's lodging perhaps—perhaps that is the best that can be given—and then they are sent on to the next community to be taken care of.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. I am very familiar with the towns mentioned by the Senator, every one of them. I do not believe in a single instance they have asked anything from the State or the Government or any one else. They have taken care of their own relief. Naturally they are going to pass on all of these people they can. They will send them on to New Mexico if we organize a rehabilitation camp down there, or to New York, or wherever we organize one. Perhaps we can spare some more out there. All the Senator is proposing to do with this \$15,000,000 is to encourage a lot more people to become gypsy travelers in the United States.

Mr. CUTTING. Our responsibility is greater than that, may I say to the Senator from Iowa. If Iowa will not attend to them and no other State will attend to them, and municipalities all over the country are shirking their responsibility in this respect, is it not the duty of the Federal Government to take care of its own, to take care of the responsibility which is a national responsibility, just as this whole relief responsibility is a national one and not a private or State or municipal responsibility?

The conditions which exist in the country—and I am not speaking merely of the transient problem, but of the whole relief problem—are national in their scope. That seems to me the main principle involved in the vote which will be taken in a moment on the substitute of the Senator from New York. It is the responsibility of the National Government to see that its citizens do not starve. That is the only question involved in the vote we are going to take this afternoon.

We have heard learned discussions as to relative responsibilities of the States, the municipalities, and the Federal Government. What are those responsibilities? Mr. President, the Government is not a set of rulers to decide in their wisdom just what responsibility they have to the people over whom they rule. Our Government is the citizenship of the Nation organized for public purposes. The duty that the Government owes to its citizens is the duty that society owes to its members.

Can there be any obligation of society toward its members as sacred or as fundamental as the duty of keeping them alive?

We talk about self-liquidating projects. We talk about profits. We talk about loans and rates of interest. Society does not owe its members the primary duty of seeing that they make a profit by loaning money through channels of investment or in any other way. That may or may not be desirable as a secondary goal. Most religions have declared it usury. But whether it be desirable or not, it is not primary. The primary right, I submit, is the right to be

safe from starvation. Personally I should add the right to maintain a decent standard of living, and in that respect my only criticism of the pending measure is that I think the funds provided are inadequate. But, regardless of that, the principle contained in the measure is sound.

The theory of the amendment is that the minor groups of citizens, the States, and municipalities, should assume the primary responsibility and that the large organization, the Federal Government, should loan money and make a profit out of the loan. I think that theory is at variance with the facts as they exist in the country. I do not believe these loans will ever be repaid. But whether that is so or whether it is not so, I think the substitute is founded on a false theory. I think it is contrary to sound policies of public welfare.

If ever there was a duty toward any body of our citizenship, it is the duty involved in the provisions of this act which the Senator from Iowa is now attempting to strike from the bill. Here we have perhaps a million, perhaps more—it is impossible to get adequate figures, but some have estimated it as high as five million—but let us say a million of the youth of this country traveling about the United States trying to get jobs, homeless, being unable to get any relief from local communities, from local charities, from municipalities, or from States. What are we going to do with them? Ten per cent of them it is estimated come from the so-called hobo class. The remaining 90 per cent are the most ambitious, the most intelligent, the most courageous of our young men.

I submit, Mr. President, that there is no section of the bill which is more necessary and more important than this section, and I trust that the Senate will not allow the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to prevail.

EXHIBIT A

DIGEST OF LETTERS RECEIVED FROM MAYORS

The following excerpts, arranged by States, showing local methods of dealing with the transient problem, are taken from letters received in response to a questionnaire sent to the mayors of all cities and towns in the United States, requesting information concerning local unemployment-relief problems. The summary given here is based upon replies to the question, "How are you meeting the problem of the transient unemployed in need of relief?"

"ALABAMA

"Piedmont (3,668): Pass them on—occasionally give meals to worthy cases.
 "Dothan (16,046): Through the Salvation Army.
 "Ozark (3,103): One meal and one night's lodging.
 "Florala (2,580): Unable financially to handle.
 "Jasper (5,313): Small portion of food and send on.
 "Andalusia (5,154): Have none.
 "Prichard (4,580): Not meeting the problem at all.
 "Selma (18,012): One night's lodging, two meals, and insist they move on. Handled very inadequately.
 "Opp (2,918): Usually feed and transport to next city.
 "Gadsden (24,042): Through Salvation Army.
 "Union Springs (2,875): Give temporary relief on work basis, except with women when direct relief is given.
 "Atmore (3,035): Temporary relief while present.
 "Nine of these cities have an increase in their own unemployment problem over last year of from 75 to over 200 per cent. Three report no city appropriation at all to meet the problem.

"ARIZONA

"Nogales (6,006): Emergency relief only.
 "Bisbee (8,023): No serious problem, but recently increasing.
 "Nogales has an increase of over 100 per cent in unemployment over last year with only a 40 per cent increase in appropriation. Bisbee has no legal city appropriation for the care of their own unemployed.

"ARKANSAS

"Searcy (3,387): Met through Good Fellows fund.
 "Hope (6,008): Unable to meet the problem.
 "Texarkana (10,764): Only feeding them.
 "Dermott (2,942): Met with State funds.
 "Paragould (5,966): A meal and, if ill, possibly transportation home.
 "Stamps (2,705): With local funds.
 "McGehee (3,488): Sleep in city jail and city hall; get them out of town as soon as possible.
 "Pine Bluff (20,760): Put them to work and make use of flop house.
 "Wynne (3,505): Small amounts from community chest.
 "Crossett (2,811): Have few.
 "Mena (3,118): Very few helped.
 "Forrest City (4,594): Trying to pass up, as we have no funds.
 "Helena (8,316): Fairly well.
 "Arkadelphia (3,380): Pushing them on.

"El Dorado (16,421): Trying to care for them through the Salvation Army.

"De Queen (2,938): Impossible to care for; it is our hardest problem.

"Van Buren (5,182): Not taking care of them.

"Brinkley (3,046): Through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"Fort Smith (31,429): By the Salvation Army.

"Some of these cities show an increase in unemployment over 1931 up to 600 per cent. Several state that their appropriation for care of the unemployed has been cut off due to delinquent taxes. A number have no appropriation for their own unemployed. One, Dermott, states that 90 per cent of the city will need help this winter.

" CALIFORNIA

"Maywood (6,794): No relief; can't take care of our citizens.

"Long Beach (142,032): Single males slept and fed three days. Families given emergency relief and returned to original residence.

"Los Gatos (3,168): Two meals; overnight lodging.

"Piedmont (9,333): Have none.

"San Mateo (13,444): City gives three meals and bed; repairs shoes, clothes, etc.

"Auburn (2,661): Temporary relief only.

"Red Bluff (3,517): Small amount of food and gasoline.

"Needles (3,144): City can not handle them.

"Porterville (5,303): Don't have to meet the problem.

"Lompoc (2,845): Give necessary meal.

"Fresno (52,513): Night's lodging and two meals in return for four hours' work.

"Tulare (6,207): Street cleaning and municipal wood-yard work at 25 cents per hour, which is paid in groceries.

"Roseville (6,425): Send them on, as have no place to house them.

"Coronado (5,425): State work camps.

"Burlingame (13,270): The cities of Burlingame, San Mateo, and Hillsborough, with a combined population of 32,000, all within a radius of 2½ miles. Jointly we have prepared a shelter with a service capacity of about 60. Our service consists of lodging in clean bunks and wholesome food. We require each man to take a bath and have all clothing fumigated; we also have a barber shop and shoe-repairing equipment, both operated by capable itinerants, who are willing to remain for their food and bed; we also have a hospital service, local doctors donating their time, local druggists furnish the drugs gratis, local merchants donate the majority of the food, and local residents cast-off clothing. We allow only overnight service for all, except those who require medical treatment; each man must work at least two hours each day on the wood pile; the accumulating wood is given to the poor. I might say that our plan is working splendidly. Since opening the shelter we do not allow begging and can see a decided falling off in this respect.

"Lynwood (7,323): No provision.

"Gardena (15,969): No assistance given.

"Banning (2,752): Meals, temporary lodging, and gasoline in exchange for work in city wood yard.

"Redlands (14,177): State labor camps, forestry work.

"Gilroy (3,502): One good meal and more if they work.

"Pasadena (76,086): Minor factor.

"Fullerton (10,860): 2 meals, 1 night's lodging in return for work. Kitchen and bunk house sponsored by American Legion.

"Pomona (20,804): Work for meal and place to sleep, and move on.

"San Gabriel (7,224): Welfare association gives temporary relief.

"Ontario (13,583): Feed and pass them on.

"Montebello (5,498): Through Salvation Army.

"San Luis Obispo (8,276): 1 meal, bunk, good-by.

"Huntington Beach (3,690): No plan.

"Corona (7,018): Fed and housed where necessary in city-hall basement, in exchange for wood-yard work.

"Tracy (3,829): Have heavy transient problem. We are a terminal on the railroad. Trains stop here and unload the itinerants. Being satisfactorily handled with large wood yard. Any itinerant can get two days' supply of food for two hours' work. We use a large number of married men with families. Use large number of married men to cut this wood along the river. It is then hauled into the wood yard. These married men get \$2 per day in food or rent. Each man allowed enough work each month to pay for what supplies he requires.

"Hermosa Beach (4,796): No funds, although some relief probably given.

"Merced (7,066): City assists the Salvation Army.

"Claremont (2,719): Given chance to earn lodging and meals at wood yard or rock pile.

"La Verne (2,860): Police supervise woodpile on which transients given work in return for food and lodging.

"Berkeley (82,109): Temporary shelter at Y. M. C. A. (community-chest funds).

"Yuba City (3,605): 15-cent meal tickets.

"San Rafael (8,022): Established shelter with lodging, meals, heat, and light in return for two hours' work; 2-day stop.

"Dunsmuir (2,610): Unable to care for them.

"Sunnyvale (3,094): Shelter only this year.

"Redondo Beach (9,347): Not meeting the problem.

"Chino (3,118): Getting them to San Bernardino County welfare committee.

LXXVI—283

"The increase in unemployment in most of the cities is up to about 60 per cent, a few with 200 per cent. However, for instance, Long Beach this year can spend only \$31,000 for this relief as against \$468,000 in 1932. San Rafael, with no appropriation for the city, says that funds can not be raised privately to adequately handle the situation.

" COLORADO

"Only three cities have reported on the problem here. Denver reports that families are cared for by the community chest and transient men by missions. Montrose reports the problem negligible. Grand Junction reports the problem cared for by the Salvation Army and Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds, and says that the county supplies transportation to destination.

" CONNECTICUT

"New London (29,640): Price of meal and overnight shelter.

"Naugatuck (14,000): No report.

"Stratford (19,212): Through a grocery order charged to their home place.

"Meriden (38,481): Through Salvation Army and charities department.

"Hartford (164,072): Shelter run jointly by city and community chest.

"Derby (10,788): No relief given.

" DELAWARE

"Of the two cities reporting on this problem, Milford (3,700) has not had any transients, and Dover (4,800) says it is not taking care of the transients.

" FLORIDA

"Fort Myers (9,000): Takes care of transients only in emergency sickness or where there are small children.

"Clearwater (7,600): Bunked in barracks. Fed at jail. Often provided with expense money for return home.

"Winter Haven (7,100): By special agencies financed by Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"Panama City (5,400): Food and sometimes transportation to point of destination.

"New Smyrna (4,100): Sleep in jail but no food.

"Pensacola (31,500): Salvation Army cares for as far as possible.

"Gainesville (10,000): Give food and shelter and attempt to return to legal residence.

"Hialeah (2,600): Have no way of caring. But surely Federal Government should do something. I could tell of some tragic cases.

"Apalachicola (3,100): Supply food for a day and move on. In some cases furnish transportation to friends.

"Arcadie (4,000): Work in wood yard; most do not want to work.

"West Palm Beach (26,600): Through the Salvation Army.

"Bradenton (5,900): Lodging for night and move on.

"Fort Pierce (4,800): Not trying to meet the problem.

"Fernandina (3,000): Where necessary paying transportation back home.

"Lake Wales (3,400): Some food and transportation.

"Increase in unemployment over 1931 runs from 75 per cent (few lower) up to 1,100 per cent. Some cities reporting no increase in appropriation, or no appropriation at all for unemployment relief.

" GEORGIA

"Moultrie (8,000): Feed and send out of town.

"Brunswick (14,000): They usually work for food and lodging.

"Hapeville (4,200): Probably give a meal and send them on their way.

"Atlanta (270,000): Salvation Army cares for lone men and boys and Travelers Aid for families.

"Dawson (3,800): A committee investigates—usually feeds and furnishes transportation to next town.

"Thomasville (11,700): Immediate relief such as food—furnish enough gas to get out of county.

"Rockmart (3,200): Through the Red Cross.

"Marietta (7,600): Sufficient aid to move on.

"LaGrange (20,000): Through the Salvation Army.

"Vidalia (3,500): They call from house to house for food.

" IDAHO

"Emmett (2,700): Not much troubled, a good meal and start them off again.

"Boise City (21,500): Lodging two nights, meals at Salvation Army two days, and they do temporary work in exchange.

"Burley (3,800): Employment from local funds is possible to get them home.

"Weiser (2,700): Each man one night's lodging and one meal.

"Twin Falls (8,700): Have a building where we have equipped 25 bunks for sleeping quarters for transients. Also a fully equipped kitchen and furnish sleeping quarters and two hot meals a day. Meals substantial and a man can have all he wants. Care for them not to exceed three days, when they move on to some other community.

" ILLINOIS

"Lansing (3,300): Can't care for them. Extreme emergency paid out of village miscellaneous fund.

"Pinckneyville (3,000): Doing nothing.

"Vandalia (4,300): City gives some gas and some food.

"Naperville (5,100): Given two hot meals, and, if necessary, given to understand they are to continue transient.

"Bloomington (30,000): Salvation Army and a local mission. Relief confined to one night's lodging and breakfast next day.

"Centralia (12,500): Soup kitchen and lodging place.
 "Havana (3,400): Basement in city hall can care for 25. Some nights have 20.
 "Metropolis (5,500): Can not meet the problem.
 "Carlinville (4,000): Small fund administered by chamber of commerce and Veterans' Bureau.
 "Champaign (20,000): Soup kitchens.
 "East Alton (4,500): Not helping.
 "River Forest (8,800): Not attempting to assist.
 "Mount Vernon (12,000): Just furnish place to sleep.
 "Carterville (2,800): Help a little.
 "Shelbyville (2,800): Housing.
 "Edwardsville (6,000): Temporary shelter and food.
 "Mound City (2,500): Shelter and one meal. Not able to care for them.
 "Joliet (43,000): Through-transportation agreement. Lodging, breakfast, and send them on.
 "Benton (8,200): Not being cared for.
 "De Kalb (8,500): Can not cope with problem, so many unemployed in our own community.
 "Crystal Lake (3,700): Temporary relief and lodging.
 "Monmouth (8,600): One meal and gas.
 "Geneseo (3,400): Very little to do. Give breakfast only.
 "Kankakee (20,000): Meal and bed and transportation through Travelers' Aid.
 "Dwight (2,500): Work on woodpile.
 "Dixon (9,900): Lodging in police station. Community kitchen gives them food night and morning.
 "Waukegan (33,000): Unable to meet problem.
 "Normal (6,700): Night's lodging and temporary relief only.
 "Streator (14,700): Feed and send on their way.
 "Beardstown (6,300): Are not aiding.
 "Rochelle (3,700): Food and, if they have a car, gasoline to get them to move on.
 "Lawrenceville (6,000): Gas tax and donation.
 "Batavia (5,000): Lodging and breakfast.
 "Ottawa (15,000): Feed, lodge, and pass on.
 "Princeton (4,700): Problem larger than ever. Housed in jail.
 "Westmont (2,700): Temporary aid and returned to legal address for relief.
 "Benld (2,980): Nothing to meet problem with.
 "Mattoon (14,600): Housed in jail. Coffee and rolls in morning.
 "Wheaton (8,000): Night's lodging and breakfast and sent on their way. City funds pay the bill.
 "Highwood (3,500): Even the press has called Highwood a mecca for the itinerant public; food situation is another thing—for the transient, that is.
 "Blue Island (16,500): Transients assisted to meals and sometimes to extent of getting to next town. Money raised by popular subscription.
 "In Illinois there is a high increase in unemployment over 1931, ranging from 50 per cent to 200 per cent, with the same story of no funds to appropriate in many cases. A great falling off in private agencies' work and a low weekly rate allowed to families in need.

"INDIANA

"Mitchell (3,200): Try to help along and advise to return to own communities to obtain relief.
 "Boonville (4,200): Bed and meals.
 "Elwood (10,000): One day's meals.
 "Connersville (12,000): No organized effort. Sleeping quarters at city building.
 "Aurora (4,300): Sleeping quarters in jail. American Legion and citizens furnish some food.
 "Lebanon (6,400): Merchants taking care of.
 "Garrett (4,400): Board and room two days at city station.
 "Vincennes (17,000): Have done everything possible to discourage.
 "Tipton (4,800): By private donations.
 "New Albany (25,800): Usual police methods. Sheltered and moved on.
 "Union City (3,000): Some shelter in city building. No provision for eats.
 "Noblesville (4,800): County sheriff furnishes bed and one meal.
 "Shelbyville (10,600): Salvation Army furnishes lodging and some meals.
 "Greencastle (4,600): Sleeping quarters one night each and breakfast.
 "Huntington (13,400): Fed well and helped on way.
 "West Terre Haute (3,500): Nothing regular. Sleep at fire station and when possible citizens help a little.
 "Washington (9,000): Only lodging, no food.
 "Valparaiso (8,000): Through police fund.
 "Lawrenceburg (4,000): Through private relief agencies.
 "Oakland City (2,800): Sleep in town hall and beg. Family sometimes assisted to next place.
 "Kendallville (5,400): Mostly fed by private parties.
 "Mount Vernon (5,000): Donations by citizens as each case comes up.
 "Salem (3,100): Few helped by Red Cross, rest by private donations.
 "La Porte (15,700): No provisions made for them here.

"IOWA

"Fairfield (6,600): Furnish produce, and they cook it themselves at city jail.
 "Des Moines (142,000): Through Travelers' Aid, Salvation Army, and American Legion.

"Oskaloosa (10,000): Sleep at police station. Work on woodpile for meals furnished by Salvation Army under direction of transient committee.

"Cherokee (6,400): Do nothing—only in case of emergency.
 "Carroll (4,600): Fed at the city hall.
 "Dubuque (41,000): Handled through private agencies.
 "Mason City (23,000): Fed and lodged overnight only.
 "Bettendorf (2,700): One meal and flop and on your way.
 "Fort Dodge (21,800): Through Salvation Army supported by community chest funds.
 "Council Bluffs (42,000): Salvation Army and citizens' committee.
 "Nevada (3,100): Feed in return for work on wood lot.
 "Independence (3,600): Free lodging only.
 "Cresco (3,000): One meal and one night's lodging.
 "Burlington (26,700): Meals through Social Service League.
 "Waterloo (46,000): Salvation Army operates food kitchen near woodpile and a small cot house. Took care of 561 in 1932.
 "Ottumwa (28,000): Referred to soup kitchen for a meal and then on their way elsewhere.
 "Glenwood (4,200): Lodging and breakfast once only.

"KANSAS

"Herrington (4,500): One night's shelter and permitted to solicit from citizens (about 750 per month).
 "Marysville (4,000): Food and transportation.
 "Winfield (9,300): Through the Salvation Army.
 "Anthony (2,900): Temporary aid and passing them on.
 "Caney (2,700): Aid in smallest amounts possible with funds collected by popular subscription.
 "Horton (4,000): Not meeting the problem—can't.
 "Eureka (3,600): Welfare association board has budget for this.
 "Wellington (7,400): No system.
 "Galena (4,700): Must shift for themselves.
 "Independence (12,000): Food and lodging on limited scale.
 "Newton (11,000): Through the Red Cross, Salvation Army, and Associated Charities.
 "Hays (4,600): Get them out of town as soon as possible and help just as little as possible.
 "Wichita (111,000): Discouraging transients. Salvation Army gives only temporary aid.
 "Fredonia (3,400): Feed and provide what is necessary to keep moving.
 "Lawrence (13,700): Try to get them to their legal residence.
 "Council Grove (2,800): Help only in extreme emergency.
 "Parsons (14,900): Through Salvation Army soup kitchen.
 "Garnett (2,700): Work men on rock pile for meals.
 "There is a large increase in unemployment over 1931 in Kansas, ranging from 50 per cent to 200 per cent and over, with a very low weekly allowance to families.

"KENTUCKY

"Shelbyville (4,000): Moving them on.
 "Mayfield (8,000): Through donations.
 "Russellville (3,000): Not being met, saving by individual help.
 "Paris (6,000): Lodging and food.
 "Ashland (29,000): Through local agencies.
 "Harrodsburg (4,000): Lodging—no food unless necessary.
 "Princeton (4,700): Not meeting the problem.
 "Covington (65,000): Problem met through Red Cross and St. Elizabeth's Hospital.
 "Hopkinsville (10,700): Forced to leave if in good health and able to travel. Old persons and children fed until transportation can be arranged out of community.
 "Cynthiana (4,300): Police and fire departments give ticket for bowl of soup.
 "Catlettsburg (5,000): Met through the government, Red Cross, and Elks.

"LOUISIANA

"Lake Charles (15,700): The city this year can do nothing.
 "Merryville (2,600): Feed if we can and send on. We can not meet this problem.
 "Gretna (9,500): Through local agencies and reconstruction.
 "Bossier City (4,003): Through Red Cross.
 "DeRidder (3,700): Have not solved the problem, except to have them move on.
 "Haynesville (2,500): Through private donations.
 "Winfield (3,700): Can not meet the problem; nothing to give relief with.
 "Houma (6,500): Can not meet the problem. They are a drain on the individuals in the community who feed, house, and pass them on to the next city.
 "Eunice (3,500): Give small amount for immediate needs.
 "Abbeville (4,300): One night bed and board.
 "Crawley (7,600): With a local soup kitchen.
 "In this State there seems to be no funds from which transient relief could come. There is an increase in unemployment from 50 to 280 per cent. One city says they have no increase because all of their people were thrown out of employment in 1930, and unless they have some help for themselves 75 per cent of the present home owners will be homeless by 1934. Another says that 75 per cent of the laboring people are in need of relief.

"MAINE

"Bath (9,000): Through Salvation Army, Poor Department, Red Cross, and Gospel Mission.
 "Waterville (1,500): Police department gives breakfast. Not serious problem.

"Fort Fairfield (2,600): No transients in winter; keep them moving in summer.

"Calais (5,400): Try to feed and keep moving.

"Bangor (28,000): Do nothing except charity food and shelter.

"Eastport (3,400): Attempt to collect from legal residence for any help given.

"Lewiston (35,000): Have few. Usually manage to return to their settlement.

"Biddeford (17,600): Transient paupers out of State charged to State health and welfare department. Those from other municipalities to those municipalities.

"Ellsworth (3,500): By subscription.

" MARYLAND

"Hagerstown (30,000): Through Salvation Army.

"Annapolis (12,500): By mayor's contingent fund.

"Laurel (2,500): One meal only.

"Westminster (4,400): By Children's Aid Society.

"Crisfield (3,800): House and feed while in city.

"Cumberland (37,700): Eating and sleeping quarters only for a limited time.

"Frederick (14,400): By county institutions and Salvation Army.

" MASSACHUSETTS

"Northampton (24,000): In Y. M. C. A. or basement of police building.

"Ware (7,300): By police department through donations from individuals.

"Provincetown (3,800): The best we can.

"Clinton (12,800): Care for by police department. Lodged for night; something to eat in morning and sent on their way.

"Waltham (39,000): Through construction work.

"Newburyport (15,000): Salvation Army and private agencies.

"Haverhill (48,000): Sent to State poor farm or 'infirmary' at Tewksbury.

"Lynn (102,000): \$3 to \$4 cash.

"Dartmouth (8,700): Return at expense of State or town to place of settlement.

"Amherst (5,800): Night's lodging; usually breakfast; sometimes supper.

"Orange (5,300): Not much bothered. Lock up at police station for night (warm bed). Give good breakfast and send on way.

"Taunton (37,000): Nothing being done.

"Walpole (7,000): Through welfare board.

"North Attleboro (10,000): Food, fuel, clothing, etc. Those able to work for aid paid \$2.50 a day.

"Hingham (6,600): Giving work.

"Marlboro (15,500): Through Red Cross and other private organizations.

"Many cities in Massachusetts report that they have no transient problem.

" MICHIGAN

"Coldwater (6,700): Feed one meal and keep overnight. They get their own supper or breakfast for 6 cents each.

"Negaunee (6,500): Handled by police department. Each man gets two nights' lodging and four meals and orders to leave town.

"Greenville (4,700): Charged back to the community from which they come. So far reimbursed for all except 5 per cent.

"Kalamazoo (54,000): Two meals; managed by Federation of Labor.

"Ann Arbor (27,000): Not taken care of.

"East Detroit (6,000): Very few. Given night's lodging in jail.

"Jackson (55,000): Cared for mostly by private contributions.

"Detroit (1,560,000): Housed, fed, and cases looked into.

"Ishpeming (9,000): Given two meals by Salvation Army and moved on.

"Buchanan (4,000): Sleeping quarters only.

"Gladstone (5,000): Handled by superintendent of poor and Salvation Army.

"Berkley (5,500): Cared for and cost charged back to place of last legal residence.

"Grand Lodge (3,500): Lodging overnight and one meal.

"Lansing (78,000): Single men housed and fed by Volunteers of America, who are helped by city.

"Dowagiac (5,500): Shelter only.

"River Rouge (17,000): Minor problem. Either contact relatives or return family to legal residence.

"Ionia (6,000): Through the county jail.

"Melvindale (4,000): Few here. Attempting to return to proper sources.

"Wakefield (3,000): In order to obtain relief here applicant must have resided in city two years and be citizen of the United States.

" MINNESOTA

"Owatonna (7,600): Meals and necessary funds to keep going to their destination.

"St. Louis Park (4,700): Temporary aid and removal to home place.

"Northfield (4,000): Lodging in jail. Small hand-outs of food.

"Fergus Falls (9,000): Temporary relief and pass them on.

"Sauk Rapids (2,600): Not caring for problem.

"Duluth (101,000): Caring for 600 men at Bethel—for men.

"Marshall (3,000): Meal tickets for one meal.

"Eveleth (7,000): A meal and ask them to move on.

"Lake City (3,000): Lodging one night at city jail for single men. Hotel furnished for women and families. One meal (if weather bad, more) and gas for those with cars.

"Austin (12,000): Meal tickets given by police.

"Willmar (6,000): Food twice a day through Salvation Army.

"Montevideo (4,300): Police department takes a record. They are given a 20-cent meal through a ticket system. Told to leave town as soon as possible and not repeat.

"White Bear Lake (2,600): Local welfare organization gives meal tickets in exchange for work.

"Luverne (2,600): Lodging and some food.

"Blue Earth (2,800): One meal and keep them moving.

"Minneapolis (464,000): Through the Union City Mission

"Stillwater (7,000): Through private relief agencies.

"Crosby (3,400): Through private charity.

"New Ulm (7,300): Feed individually. No relief by city or welfare committee.

"Hastings (5,000): Shift for themselves.

"Worthington (3,800): Place to sleep and one 15-cent ticket for meal or groceries given by city.

"A very high percentage in increase of unemployment in Minnesota.

" MISSISSIPPI

"Columbia (4,800): Feeding them.

"Louisville (3,000): Given food.

"Starkville (3,600): Lodging and having them move on.

"Kosciusko (3,200): We are not meeting the problem.

"Tupelo (6,000): Food and lodging worked out on municipal projects. Where not able to work, asking them to move on.

"Belzoni (2,700): Through the Red Cross.

"Biloxi (14,800): Nothing being attempted in this connection.

"Vicksburg (22,900): This city gives a monthly allowance to the Salvation Army to meet this problem.

"Several of the Mississippi cities report that they can not make an allowance for unemployment relief because of their finances.

" MISSOURI

"Webb City (6,800): Salvation Army looks after and sleep men in city hall.

"Independence (15,000): Feed and advise them to return to home communities.

"Brookfield (6,000): Work them in wood yard.

"Ferguson (4,000): Lodge in city hall basement. Make no attempt to feed.

"Marceline (3,500): Through private agency.

"Mexico (8,000): Sleep in city hall and ticket for breakfast.

"Joplin (33,000): Two meals and one bed.

"Crystal City (3,000): One night's lodging and transportation to next stop.

"Aurora (3,800): Temporary relief and get back to their homes.

"Trenton (7,000): City furnishing lodging.

"Maryville (5,000): Taking care only of necessities.

"Kirksville (8,000): Place to sleep, one hour work on wood pile, and one meal ticket.

"Boonville (6,400): Food; lodging at city calaboose.

"Warrensburg (5,000): Try to care for immediate needs and furnish transportation out of town.

"Poplar Bluff (7,500): Cared for inadequately. Permit them to beg without fear of arrest and sleep in police station.

"Lebanon (3,500): Not meeting the problem.

"Chaffee (2,900): Allow to sleep in city hall basement and push on to Memphis or St. Louis, where there are facilities for caring for them.

"Charleston (3,300): They cut wood.

"Monett (4,000): Have a club to take care of them.

"Carthage (9,000): Give them something to eat and send on.

"Washington (5,900): Through private subscription.

"Sedalia (20,000): They have sleeping quarters in city jail and two meals per day through the Salvation Army.

"Perryville (2,900): Cared for through local Red Cross.

"Higginsville (3,300): In the city jail.

"Fredericktown (2,900): Through a community fund.

"Jefferson City (21,000): One meal at Salvation Army. Sleep in city hall.

" MONTANA

"Deer Lodge (3,500): A summer problem. City and county jointly operated a soup kitchen last summer and over 200 fed daily.

"Roundup (2,500): No organized relief.

"Miles City (7,000): City soup kitchen and lodging.

"Among the few cities reporting in this State there is a percentage of increase in unemployment up to 700 per cent. Three cities report no city appropriation for the unemployed.

" NEBRASKA

"Grand Island (18,000): City feeding and housing them.

"Lincoln (75,900): Through missions and Salvation Army.

"Alliance (6,000): Lodging in jail one night only. Labor not to exceed one day.

"Nebraska City (7,000): Soup kitchen at police station.

"Beatrice (10,000): Sleeping quarters in city hall and ticket for breakfast.

"Hastings (15,000): Salvation Army and Red Cross and city furnish meals at 15 cents.

"Superior (3,000): Food and shelter one day.

"Lexington (2,900): Meal and bed and send on.

"Kearney (8,000): Help them along.

"Sidney (3,300): Doing nothing.

"Fremont (11,000): Fed through Salvation Army. City payr Salvation Army in return for work on woodpile.

"NEVADA"

"Las Vegas (5,000): Single unemployed work for two meals. Families cared for on emergency basis and plans made to return to legal residence.

"NEW HAMPSHIRE"

"Franklin (6,000): One meal; one night's lodging.
 "Lebanon (6,000): Through a Salvation Army fund left from two years ago.
 "Concord (25,000): Given temporary relief.
 "Exeter (4,000): Lodging overnight and breakfast.
 "Laconia (12,000): City feeds them.

"NEW JERSEY"

"Camden (118,000): Food orders while unemployed.
 "Metuchen (5,000): None considered for relief.
 "North Plainfield (9,000): Emergency food order and night's lodging in police headquarters.
 "Haledon (4,000): Can not meet the situation.
 "Butler (3,300): Giving temporary relief.
 "Cliffside Park (15,000): Removing to legal residence.
 "Maywood (3,400): No way of helping.
 "Egg Harbor (3,000): Give relief where necessary and order to former residence.
 "Rockaway (3,000): Not trying to meet it.
 "Atlantic City (66,000): Give them emergency orders, and if they do not have legal settlement refuse further aid.
 "Phillipsburg (19,000): Sleeping quarters and bread. They must beg other food.
 "Margate City (2,900): Try to feed for two days and request them to leave.
 "Carlstadt (5,000): Night's lodging and meals.
 "A great majority of the cities in New Jersey state that it will be impossible for them to care for their unemployed—at least, not without aid.

"NEW MEXICO"

"Deming (3,000): Public work in exchange for food and lodging.
 "Alamogordo (3,000): Not meeting it.
 "Tucumcari (4,100): Not meeting problem.
 "Roswell (11,000): Through Salvation Army soup kitchen and beds.
 "Raton (6,000): Sleeping quarters and food orders.
 "Santa Fe (11,000): Have no city funds for this, same being handled privately.
 "Clovis (8,000): Through the Salvation Army.
 "Of the 7 cities in New Mexico answering this question 4 state that they can not care for all their unemployed this winter, 2 can, and 1 can if present Federal aid continues.

"NEW YORK"

"Cohoes (23,000): Transportation from private funds. Emergency relief until residence established.
 "Frankfort (4,000): Not meeting the problem.
 "Gowanda (3,000): Shelter and breakfast in local jail. (Had 800 in 1932.)
 "Canton (2,800): Meal and lodging and they go on.
 "Greenport (3,000): If resident of some other State, cooperate with private agencies and make sure he gets sufficient temporary relief till he reaches legal settlement.
 "Baldwinsville (3,800): Sending back to towns from which they came.
 "East Syracuse (4,600): Town and county welfare relief.
 "Monticello (3,400): Helped by charity.
 "Batavia (17,000): Red Cross gives food and Catholic Charities (Inc.) also assist.
 "Massena (10,000): Lodging at police station.
 "Fredonia (5,800): Free lodging and meals contributed by private and public relief.
 "Rochester (328,000): A county problem. Usually send them back to place of settlement.
 "Granville (3,400): Food and shelter in jail. Veterans cared for by American Legion.
 "Potsdam (4,000): Housing and night's lodging.
 "Seneca Falls (6,000): Have no means for handling.
 "Amsterdam (38,000): Give them night's lodging and couple of meals. If more required refer them to county commissioner of public welfare.
 "Haverstraw (2,800): Helped when asked.
 "Olean (21,000): Lodge at police station. Eat at Salvation Army.
 "Watervliet (16,000): Billed to home community.
 "Irvington (3,000): Free lodging and breakfast at police quarters.
 "Dunkirk (17,000): They are taken care of among the people. Are taken care of.
 "Hamburg (4,700): One night's lodging, meals, and instructions to move on.
 "Kingston (28,000): Private agencies and police department.
 "Lynbrook (13,000): No relief given.
 "Garden City (7,000): On village improvements.
 "Mechanicville (7,900): Give lodging.
 "Wellsville (5,600): Through Salvation Army.
 "Tonawanda (12,000): Emergency relief until they can be sent back to legal residence.
 "Ogdensburg (16,900): Taking care of and charging back to place of residence.
 "Johnstown (10,800): By Salvation Army and police department charged back to welfare department.
 "Fulton (12,000): Sheltered overnight and fed.

"Lackawanna (23,000): Through police and Father Baker's institution.

"Dunkirk (17,800): Through private agencies.
 "The increase in unemployment over 1931 is large in New York. The appropriations for unemployment in many cases are much smaller than the reported increase in unemployment. In some cases this appropriation shows a decrease. The percentage contributed by private agencies is on the whole small.

"NORTH CAROLINA"

"Charlotte (82,000): Work on woodpile. Have adequate shelter, etc.
 "Burlington (9,700): We ask them to go home.
 "Lexington (9,600): Room and meals.
 "Concord (11,800): The Salvation Army provides quarters.
 "Thomasville (10,000): Lodging and meals and help them reach destination.
 "Edenton (3,500): Give food and shelter and pass on.
 "Smithfield (2,500): Sleeping quarters and one meal.
 "Cherryville (2,700): Send back or on their way.
 "Salisbury (16,900): Through Salvation Army, Travelers' Aid, and R. F. C.
 "Morehead City (3,400): No definite program.
 "Rockingham (2,900): Can not meet the problem.
 "Raleigh (37,000): Relief committee supplements budget for this.
 "Rocky Mount (21,000): Through the Salvation Army.
 "Goldsboro (14,900): Through the Salvation Army.
 "In North Carolina it is noticeable that the appropriation for unemployment relief does not keep pace with the increase in unemployment. For instance Salisbury reports a 100 per cent in unemployment and no increase in appropriation. Rockingham an increase of 200 per cent in unemployment and no increase in appropriations and the private agencies, help has increased only 20 per cent.

"NORTH DAKOTA"

"Williston (5,000): Allowed to eat at community kitchen.
 "Bismarck (11,000): Community kitchen.
 "Valley City (5,000): Give them a meal and send them on.
 "Williston shows a 100 per cent increase in unemployment over 1931 with a 33½ per cent increase in appropriation for unemployed and no private agencies helping and an inability to issue more bonds.

"OHIO"

"Findlay (19,800): Through the Salvation Army.
 "Newark (30,000): Through the Salvation Army and county commissioners.
 "Chillicothe (18,000): Handled through local funds.
 "Tiffin (16,000): American Legion handles.
 "Kenton (7,000): Help two out of five.
 "Oxford (2,500): Through donations.
 "Greenville (7,000): Shelter for night and breakfast.
 "Miamisburg (5,500): Transportation and feeding and lodging where necessary.
 "Zanesville (36,000): Have given funds to Salvation Army for this purpose.
 "Rittman (2,700): Not aiming to meet their needs.
 "Canton (10,000): Lodging houses for 24 to 48 hours.
 "Upper Sandusky (3,800): Not in position to offer much.
 "Wellston (5,300): Lodging only.
 "Lorain (44,500): Salvation Army handles at 20 cents per individual per week.
 "Shelby (6,000): Lodging in city jail; some clothing and shoes.
 "Shadyside (4,000): Fed by citizens and permitted sleep in jail.
 "Warren (41,000): Lodged in city-rented building by Salvation Army and fed and such necessities as Salvation Army can supply.
 "Ashland (11,000): Feed them for 15 cents a meal.
 "Orrville (4,400): Lodging; that's all.
 "Waterville (2,800): Doing nothing.
 "Ashtabula (23,300): Do not care for.
 "Wapakoneta (5,000): Help them to next place.
 "Mansfield (33,000): Through private agencies.
 "East Liverpool (23,000): Flop and breakfast only.
 "Maumee (4,500): Out of our own and the mayor's pocket 15 cents a meal.
 "Elyria (25,600): Through the Salvation Army.
 "Hillsboro (4,000): Through Red Cross.
 "Medina (4,000): Feed them at town hall from donations.
 "Marion (31,000): Salvation Army feeds at 8 cents a meal.
 "Bedford (6,000): Housed in jail and small amount of food.
 "Cincinnati (451,000): Through a central registry and transient service bureau.
 "Kent (8,000): Just sleeping quarters.
 "Circleville (7,000): Two meals and one night's lodging.
 "Conneaut (9,000): Not meeting it.
 "Dayton (200,900): One to two night's lodging and meals.
 "North Olmsted (2,000): Food and sleeping quarters.
 "Bexley (7,000): Sending them into Columbus, Ohio.
 "Euclid (12,000): Temporary relief in the form of overnight housing.
 "Fairport (4,900): Through branch of Red Cross.
 "Wadsworth (5,900): Giving free lunch and lodging.
 "Cleveland (900,000): Being met by Wayfarers Lodge, which is operated by Associated Charities. It is supported in part by the community fund, part by the city of Cleveland, and part by county of Cuyahoga, with the assistance of State funds (in 1932).
 "The proportion of increase for 1932 as compared with the unemployment problem in 1931 is very great in Ohio. In few of

the cities does it go below 50 per cent above the 1931 figure, running round 100 per cent and over in almost all the cities reporting. The appropriation for unemployment has not increased in the same proportion. We find a city with 160 per cent increase in unemployment and only 100 per cent increase in appropriation; another with 200 per cent increase in unemployment and 100 per cent increase in appropriation; another with 95 per cent increase in unemployment and 45 per cent increase in appropriation. Out of 47 cities only 2 reported a weekly allowance to a family of over \$5—most of them running between \$2.50 and \$4. In a number of cases funds of private agencies have decreased.

"OKLAHOMA"

"Nowata (3,500): Feed them one day.
 "Marlow (3,000): In extreme cases feed and send out of town. In most cases just send out of town.
 "Shawnee (232,000): Salvation Army soup kitchen; also a church and a Federal post at Fort Sill with cots.
 "Seminole (11,000): Emergency relief. Advising them to pass on.
 "Holdenville (7,000): Let them sleep in flop house; give a bowl of soup in the morning and order them out of town.
 "Purcell (2,800): Give temporary beds, a cheap meal, a small allowance of gasoline.
 "Okmulgee (17,000): Handled by Salvation Army, supported by city.
 "Wewoka (10,000): Give a meal, lodging, and send on way.
 "Wilson (2,500): Not meeting the problem.
 "Guthrie (9,500): Give meal or a little gas.
 "Cordell (2,900): Unable to do anything.
 "Hugo (5,000): Meet it out of our own pockets.
 "Vinita (4,200): Through a community kitchen.
 "Altus (8,000): Temporary relief only. Pushing them on where possible.
 "Ada (11,000): Give them one day's work and have them move on.
 "Out of 13 cities answering a question as to whether the city can care for all who will need relief 11 answer 'no,' 1 'barely possible,' and 1 can 'with outside help.'

"OREGON"

"Roseburg (4,000): Through Salvation Army (city pays expense).
 "St. Helens (3,900): Sending them on.
 "Pendleton (6,600): Giving them a meal or two and one night's lodging.

"PENNSYLVANIA"

"Turtle Creek (10,600): Do nothing.
 "Doylestown (4,500): Meet from private contributions.
 "New Castle (48,000): No provision for this.
 "Oakmont (6,000): Not meeting the problem.
 "Red Lion (4,700): Meeting it in part.
 "South Fork (3,200): Can not now take care of them.
 "Kulpmont (6,000): Must take care of themselves.
 "Elizabethtown (3,900): Night housing and hand-outs from citizens.
 "Pen Argyl (4,000): Community welfare funds.
 "Chambersburg (13,700): Through Salvation Army; Traveler's Relief.
 "North East (3,600): Feeding from borough funds in the a. m. only.
 "Erie (115,000): Lodging only.
 "Elizabeth (2,900): Night's shelter in jail.
 "New Cumberland (4,200): Trust to luck and depend on housewife.
 "Homestead (20,000): Through a soup line and housed in municipal building.
 "Quakerstown (4,800): Night's lodging and some breakfast.
 "Tamaqua (12,900): At a restaurant where city pays for food, and the Salvation Army.
 "Scranton (143,000): Refer to place of legal settlement.
 "Gettysburg (5,500): Night's lodging and breakfast.
 "Crafton Borough (7,000): Bath, two meals, and a place to sleep.
 "Wyoming (2,700): Can not meet problem at all.
 "Avalon (5,900): Feed at police station.
 "Sunbury (15,000): Not encouraged to remain in city. Chronic itinerants, known to police usually committed to county jail for 10 days, affording opportunity to clean up, bathe, and get their clothes clean and stomachs full. Others are furnished with lodging as follows: City hall for 1932, 5,200; Y. M. C. A. (restricted to certain classes), 517. No clothing or food furnished. Local hospital feeds such persons to extent of extra food prepared and not consumed.
 "Spangler (2,700): Place to sleep and breakfast next morning.
 "Dubois (11,000): Through Salvation Army.
 "Pitcairn (6,500): Twenty-five sleep in borough jail each night; nothing else done.
 "Wesleyville (2,800): Give what we can.
 "Springdale (4,700): House men in lockup and give local relief where necessary.
 "Pittsburgh (669,800): During past year the homeless-men problem has become acute, and in December, 1932, approximately 6,000 homeless men were given assistance. We estimate that about 3,000 of these men are residents of Allegheny County and 3,000 transients. Transient unemployed cared for by a number of agencies using funds from various sources. Just recently have arranged with the State emergency relief board to provide food

for free meals served by certain of these agencies. (For bulletin concerning service to homeless persons, write Bureau of Social Research, Federation of Social Agencies of Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, 711 Wabash Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., vol. 1, No. 2, November-December, 1932.)

"Pottstown (19,400): Lodging and breakfast.
 "Hellertown (3,800): Through welfare association.
 "Windler (9,000): Feed and a place to sleep.
 "East McKeesport (3,000): Can not care for local relief properly.
 "Reynoldsville (3,400): Bed to sleep and in many cases buy a meal.
 "Nazareth (5,500): Through poor board and police activity in making them move along.
 "Nanty-Glo (5,500): Not meeting it at all.
 "Harrisburg (80,000): Problem not being met; try to feed and lodge them.
 "Sharon (25,900): Sleepers in jail get supper and breakfast.
 "West Chester (12,000): Through Salvation Army.
 "Belle Vernon (2,400): Not meeting problem in any way; unable to.
 "Sugar Notch (2,700): Unable to meet problem.
 "Emporium (2,900): Sleep in jail and a lunch at night.
 "Taylor (10,000): Can't meet the problem.
 "Out of 69 cities answering the question as to whether the community can care for all who will need relief 46 answer 'no,' 9 will need help, 13 answer 'yes,' and 1 says 'barely.'

"SOUTH CAROLINA"

"Clinton (5,600): House and feed.
 "Greenwood (11,000): Through public subscription.
 "Marion (4,900): Partially through local board of charities.
 "Gaffney (6,800): Through Salvation Army, food and place to sleep.
 "York (2,800): Lodge for night and help get rides, if possible.
 "Darlington (5,500): Unable to aid.
 "Union (7,500): Through Salvation Army.
 "Hartsville (5,000): Meal and gas and advice to move on.
 "Easley (4,800): Not being met.
 "Charleston (62,000): Carried by Salvation Army and Star Gospel Mission. City discourages transients and strictly enforces vagrancy laws. Where transient families have come in a vain endeavor to secure work, the city has in several cases given them free transportation by truck back to original home.
 "Out of 11 cities in South Carolina answering the question as to whether the community can care for all who will need relief, 10 answer 'no.' Five cities report no appropriation to take care of unemployment. All of the cities answering the question as to whether they can float further bond issues to meet relief say 'no.'

"SOUTH DAKOTA"

"Huron (10,900): Salvation Army does the best it can.
 "Sioux Falls (33,000): Beyond one night's lodging and two meals we send them on.
 "Brookings (4,300): In extreme emergency give them meal and bed.
 "Yankton (6,000): Feed and send on.
 "Pierre (3,600): Not helping them.

"TENNESSEE"

"Columbia (7,800): Free sleeping and sometimes food.
 "Loudon (2,500): Can't help; they beg.
 "Lebanon (4,600): Have move on as fast as possible.
 "Fayetteville (3,800): Helping them out of town.
 "Franklin (3,800): Feed and give transportation money to pass on.
 "Jackson (22,000): Meals and lodging overnight and other help in sickness or absolute necessity.
 "Newport (2,900): Through street collections.
 "Milan (3,100): Help and get them out of town.
 "Kingsport (11,000): One night's lodging; not more than two meals (for which they are required to work if able), and advised to move to ultimate destination.
 "Johnson City (25,000): Whatever help they can get from the Salvation Army.
 "Shelbyville (5,000): Moving them on.
 "Harriman (4,500): Have no provision for this problem.
 "In Tennessee 5 out of 10 cities answering the question report no appropriation for relief of unemployed; 11 answer the question as to possibility of floating further bond issues for relief and 10 of these can not float issues for this purpose. Out of 10 answering the question as to increase in unemployment over 1931, 7 give over 50 per cent increase.

"TEXAS"

"Seymour (2,600): Where worthy and able to work giving employment out of Reconstruction aid.
 "Luling (5,900): Give meal and insist that they go back to their own community.
 "Jasper (3,300): Through soup kitchen only.
 "Bowie (3,000): Each case separately treated; sent to destination.
 "Brady (3,900): One meal and enough gas to get to next town.
 "Terrell (8,700): No organized effort; they solicit on street and Red Cross helps.
 "Huntsville (5,000): Giving work where possible.
 "Big Spring (13,000): Food and clothing in dire cases.
 "Edinburg (4,800): Warm room to sleep; little food to women and children and ask them to move on.
 "McAllen (9,000): Impossible to meet problem without State or Federal aid.

"Pampa (10,400): Temporary aid and ask them to move on to place of residence.

"New Braunfels (6,200): Quarters, food, and transportation furnished by city.

"Center (2,500): Temporary relief and forwarding on.

"Nacogdoches (5,800): Few days' work, depending on size of family; then ask them to move on.

"Floydada (2,600): Assisted on way by purchase of gas or securing transportation in direction headed.

"Denton (9,500): Two meals and house and require them to pass on (required to chop wood, etc.).

"Cleburne (11,500): Try to send back to homes.

"Amarillo (43,100): Met in a measure by community chest organizations.

"Canyon (2,800): Food and transportation out of town.

"Gatesville (2,600): Try to get them to go to some relation.

"Midland (5,400): Make them work on streets for 24 cents an hour. In few cases of helpless destitute, give direct relief without work.

"Gainesville (8,900): Flatly refuse to help.

"Crockett (4,400): Feed and pass on; sometimes give them groceries.

"Taylor (7,000): Through Reconstruction Finance Corporation relief funds.

"Of 32 cities answering the question as to increase in appropriations for unemployed this year over 1931; 15 report no increase; 9 report no appropriation at all for 1932; and several report a decrease. Of 37 cities answering the question as to whether further bond issues were possible for relief, 35 answer 'no' and 2 'yes.'

"UTAH

"Ogden (40,000): Bunk house and meal tickets.

"Helper (2,700): Warm place to sleep. No food.

"VERMONT

"Brattleboro (8,000): 10-cent lunches and beds in police station.

"St. Johnsbury (7,000): Temporary help at least.

"Proctor (2,500): On the woodpile.

"Windsor (3,600): Food and night's lodging by chief of police.

"VIRGINIA

"Hopewell (11,000): By Salvation Army and city contributing.

"Lynchburg (40,600): Police lodging; Salvation Army; appropriation by city.

"Fredericksburg (6,800): Emergency relief only. Night's lodging and two meals.

"Waynesboro (6,200): A hand-out.

"Covington (6,300): Red Cross.

"Norfolk (129,000): Endeavor to return to legal residence.

"Petersburg (28,500): In 90 per cent of cases send back to home cities.

"Big Stone Gap (3,900): Aid with funds to other points.

"Suffolk (10,200): One meal and required to leave city.

"In Virginia only two cities answering feel that they can meet their unemployment problem without Federal aid.

"WASHINGTON

"Bremerton (10,000): No provision. It has become quite a problem.

"Spokane (115,500): Some provision for young women and roving boys and others in extreme necessity. For a limited time. Women and indigents sometimes returned home.

"WEST VIRGINIA

"New Martinsville (2,800): Welfare assistance.

"Keyser (6,000): Through the city administration.

"Hinton (6,600): Sleeping shelter and one meal.

"Grafton (7,700): Bed and breakfast.

"Elkins (7,000): Unable to do anything except perhaps help to get to their own communities.

"Bluefield (19,000): They work for lodging and a meal.

"Fairmont (23,000): They are helped by Salvation Army.

"Hollidays Cove (4,400): Through Salvation Army.

"Benwood (3,900): Sleep in jail and ordered to leave town.

"Only one city out of nine answering the question concerning ability to care for all who will need help in community states that it will be able to take care of the situation, but it must have some help.

"WISCONSIN

"Stevens Point (13,600): Under supervision of industrial commission.

"Platteville (4,040): They pay for lodging and meals by work on rock pile.

"Hartford (3,700): Housed in jail and asked to keep going; except to be reimbursed by county system for transient expense.

"Beaver Dam (9,800): Quarters for sleeping in city jail and breakfast.

"Waupaca (3,131): Room and one meal.

"Chippewa Falls (9,500): Free meals and move on.

"Ladysmith (3,400): Work on woodpile.

"Fort Atkinson (5,700): Transients are cared for through operation of a transient station operated by the city in cooperation with local merchants, who supply considerable of the food. A total of 3,505 men registered through the station during the year 1932, all of whom received lodging, and to whom 7,749 meals were served. Transients are permitted to remain but 24 hours and to repeat not oftener than once per month.

"Menasha (9,000): Night lodging and breakfast and request to move on.

"Portage (6,300): Supper, bed, and breakfast at transient depot run by welfare association, Red Cross, etc.

"Jefferson (2,600): Lodging and breakfast provided by city.

"Stoughton (4,400): Housed in city building, fed by private individuals.

"Reedsburg (2,900): Shelter and food through police department.

"Oconto (5,000): So far by private means.

"Tomahawk (3,000): Sleep and cook in city hall. They beg and work.

"Ripon (3,900): Lodging and one meal.

"Racine (67,500): Urged not to stop. In severe weather night's food and lodging.

"Shawano (4,100): Through chamber of commerce.

"Eau Claire (26,000): By Salvation Army and city.

"Waukesha (17,000): Night's lodging at hotel. Two meals.

"Park Falls (3,036): Take care of them along with the local people.

"Rice Lake (5,100): Have specially prepared room in city building where they bathe, cook, wash, sleep, and keep warm.

"Prairie du Chien (3,900): Send to next town.

"Viroqua (2,700): Through the local community chest.

"Menomonie (5,500): Charge expense back to county.

"Delavan (3,300): Clothing and some food.

"Baraboo (5,500): House nights and breakfast.

"Fond du Lac (26,400): Shelter and food.

"Appleton (25,000): Send them to Oshkosh or Green Bay to State headquarters or to State barricades.

"Two Rivers (10,000): Place to sleep and meal and when necessary transportation home.

"Sheboygan (39,000): According to plan of industrial commissioner of Wisconsin.

"La Crosse (39,500): Quarters through industrial commissioner of Wisconsin.

"Merrill (8,400): Lodging and one meal a day.

"Oshkosh (40,000): Have a relief station.

"Janesville (21,600): Salvation Army supported by private funds. Also industrial commissioner is handling this problem.

"Madison (57,800): 24 hours' board and lodging.

"The percentage of relief in Wisconsin cities answering the questionnaire seems negligible. In answering the question as to whether the community can take care of all those who will need relief 39 cities answering this question were divided as follows: 17, no; 9, yes; 10 could with aid from outside; 3 were doubtful."

"WYOMING

"Cheyenne (17,300): Through the Salvation Army."

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the provision which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] seeks to have taken out of the so-called Wagner substitute was thoroughly debated a week ago to-day and a week ago last Saturday. The Senator from Iowa has disclosed his attitude toward all relief of the unemployed youth and others, particularly single men. The Senator from Iowa was chairman of the subcommittee on Military Affairs, which held no hearings, and reported out, in cooperation with his colleagues, the amendment to the War Department appropriation bill providing for the care of 88,000 boys in military camps. They reported it adversely and unanimously. The Senate demonstrated last Monday its disposition and desire to take care of those boys. If the Senate is of the same mind that it was then, it should ignore the motion of the Senator from Iowa. The Senator from Iowa does not care what becomes of these youths or the unemployed.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. The Senator is not justified in any such conclusion as that. As a matter of fact we have gotten along for one hundred-odd years in this Government without having to establish rehabilitation or work camps such as the Senator proposes. I do not know how many of them the Senator expects to establish in the United States. If there are a million of these men, the Senator would have the munificent sum of \$15 a piece to spend on them in these camps. As a matter of fact, it is simply the beginning of a program which, in my judgment, will finally result in taxation that can not possibly be maintained for the benefit of this type of people.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, the Senator is of just that stand-pat type, as I have told him personally. I am saying nothing now that I have not said to his face in private conversation. He is one of the men who never want to do anything new. He wants to stand pat on everything, rely upon history and precedent, and no emergency can arise anywhere in the United States, humane or otherwise, which will

budge the mind of the Senator from Iowa. His mind is eternally fixed, as solid as the Rock of Gibraltar, and no heart beat can change his position. In many respects I am as hard-boiled as he is, but, Mr. President, I refuse to be controlled by his yardstick. I refuse to be guided by his heartbeats, for I do not know whether he has any or not. But I do know that he has a lack of consideration and sympathy for the 88,000 boys for whom we provided care in military camps. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, he opposed that proposal and put it over unanimously in the committee.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COUZENS. Certainly.

Mr. CUTTING. May I point out to the Senator for the benefit of the Senator from Iowa that the provisions in the bill make no mention of camps? They leave each State to select its own methods for dealing with the situation. It might be through camps; it might be through some other method; but the primary need which is to be taken care of by the States is, when possible, to send these transients home.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. DICKINSON. I want to suggest that line 23, page 3, reads as follows:

And to aid in their rehabilitation in training and work camps.

I do not know how the English language could be any plainer than that.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—

Mr. COUZENS. I wish to point out that that provision is discretionary.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COUZENS. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I just wanted to make that very statement; that the word "camps" does not appear in the Costigan-La Follette bill. I included that merely as a suggestion to the States; but each State, in dealing with this problem, is at liberty to adopt any plan or any policy it may see fit, and is in no way limited by this legislation.

Mr. CUTTING. In other words, it is not a compulsory feature of the Senator's bill?

Mr. WAGNER. Not at all; it is merely a suggestion, which I incorporated in the bill in view of the proposal some days ago of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS].

Mr. CUTTING. It was not included in my provision. I notice that the provision in the substitute of the Senator from New York reads:

In training and work camps or otherwise.

So that is in no way a compulsory feature of the bill; it is simply left to the States to carry out their own policy, subject to the approval of the Federal board.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, in the debate we had last Monday, in particular, and on the previous Saturday, it was pointed out that there are at least a million and a quarter homeless single men alone, and the proposal I made was to take care of those from 17 to 25 years of age. It was afterwards amended in the Senate to provide for those not under 15 or over 21, which leaves unprovided for almost a million single men over 21 years of age, graduates of high schools and colleges, young men who have never had a job during the nearly four years of depression. For three years the colleges and schools have been graduating young men who have never had an opportunity for employment, who have never had an opportunity to earn a dollar. During the discussion a week ago the very excellent care that was being taken of some three or four thousand young men in the camps of California was pointed out. This money can be used to aid and augment that sort of activity. Every forester knows the opportunities in the forests of the United States to set up camps where healthy and desirable work can be afforded.

Mr. President, in view of what was said a week ago, I do not care to debate the matter any longer, but I do hope the

Senate will not approve of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRAMMER obtained the floor.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Arizona wishes to perfect the text of the proposal?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I wish to have a vote on my amendment before the vote finally comes on the motion to strike out. In other words—and I ask the Chair for advice—have I not the right to perfect it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Inasmuch as the text must be perfected before it can be otherwise dealt with, the Chair will see to it that that vote is taken on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Chair.

Mr. GRAMMER. Mr. President, I rise at this time, while this important measure is pending, with great sympathy in my heart not only for the unemployed man who is seeking and would like to secure honest employment in his vicinity but also for the man who is employed, if you please, but finds his burden heavy. When we perform an act as individuals or as a legislative body, if we wish to maintain our standing among our friends and in our respective communities, indeed, if we wish to main the standing of the Nation, we must ponder well the result of any action we may contemplate taking.

Mr. President, what will be the result in case a very large appropriation, for the purposes designed by the pending measure, shall be made by the Congress at this time? I wish to be conservative in the figures I shall give, and I shall deal in round figures. I believe that the records show that the United States Government now owes in excess of \$20,000,000,000, upon which an average of 3 per cent interest is being paid. I understand that within the last 12 years the national debt of our country has been reduced by some \$3,000,000,000. It is easy to see that if the reduction in our national debt shall continue at the same rate, namely, \$250,000,000 a year, it will require 80 years to pay the obligations which the Government now owes and should pay.

Applying the same calculation to the \$600,000,000 involved in the pending bill and computing the interest which we must pay at 3 per cent—simple, annual interest, if you please—it amounts to \$18,000,000 a year; so that in 80 years the interest alone will aggregate \$1,440,000,000. Thus, the appropriation of \$600,000,000, which we are about to make, will by that time have cost the people of the United States \$2,040,000,000.

If it shall cost 5 per cent to administer this \$600,000,000 fund, there will be left \$570,000,000 to be applied to relief, which, as I understand, is to be devoted largely to public works and similar activities.

So, Mr. President, by a very short process of division, we find that in order at this time to get the use of \$570,000,000, before that sum shall actually be repaid it will cost, as I have already said, \$2,040,000,000, and the actual present benefit to be derived from that vast expenditure will be but 28 per cent of the cost. Can we afford to indulge in such extravagance? Do we want to build roads or overhead crossings or tunnels or canals or any other imaginable project in the United States at this time, Mr. President, at an expense of 100 per cent when we can only receive 28 per cent in value? Can we afford to do that? May we do it?

Mr. President, if 2 decades be a generation, 80 years constitute 4 generations, and, according to the figures which I have given, we are starting now on the fifth generation of indebtedness. Our great-great-great-grandchildren are the ones who are to repay this \$600,000,000. Are we so cowardly as men that we are willing to mortgage the blood and the happiness of a generation five times removed from us in order to do something at this time for which we only get 28 cents on the dollar? If we should do such a thing, our posterity in their day and generation should rise up to shame the day in which we lived.

Mr. President, these may be broad statements, and they may not coincide exactly with the ideas of other Senators, but I see no other result. It seems to me that the Congress has simply gone wild; it has indulged in an orgy of appropriations for the past 25 years. Vast sums of money have been appropriated for many things. Have we received even 28 per cent for much of the money that has been appropriated by the Congress?

I want, Mr. President, to leave with the Senate this further thought: This Nation is divided into some 48 States; these States themselves have some obligations to perform through their governors and treasuries, if you please. Have they lined themselves up and said to the Congress of the United States, "We are helpless; we have used every possible resource"? And have they proven it by showing that they can not sell their bonds, that their resources are absolutely exhausted, and that it is up to Congress to supply them with money with which to feed the unemployed and take care of those who are in distress? I think, sir, that quite the opposite is the fact. It seems to me that the Congress is trying to force upon the States money with which to feed and care for their people. No doubt many people need to be taken care of, but, in my estimation, as I see it, if I were the governor of a State—which I never was and never expect to be—I think that I should make sure that the people of my State would certainly have the benefit of their own resources before I would appeal to Congress to appropriate money supplied by the taxpayers of the Nation.

Mr. President, if I may have a moment more, why do I say that? It costs money to collect the taxes and put them into the Treasury of the United States and then disburse them again. The very best thing we can do to help the taxpayer and the mortgagor and those in distress is not to collect more taxes but to leave the money in the hands of the individual who gets a hundred per cent benefit of it instead of a 28 per cent benefit, as would be the result, according to the figures I have given, of the appropriation now contemplated.

Mr. President, perhaps I should apologize for what I have said. I have only been a Member of the Senate for a short time, and my term will expire within the next two weeks. I simply have spoken to the Senate as a plain business man, giving, in a very rough way, my idea of the situation confronting us. I have not done so in a picturesque manner, but at this time we are really not considering or thinking about a beautiful picture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 4.30 o'clock having arrived, the question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3 of the substitute amendment, line 22, after the word "transients," it is proposed to insert the words "who are American citizens," so that, if amended, it will read:

SEC. 2 (a). The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized and empowered to make available out of funds of the corporation the sum of \$15,000,000, under the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, to the several States and Territories, to be used in furnishing relief and work relief to unemployed and needy transients who are American citizens—

And so forth.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is closed.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum before the vote is taken. I rose for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Byrnes	Dickinson	Hull
Austin	Capper	Dill	Johnson
Bailey	Caraway	Fess	Kean
Bankhead	Carey	Fletcher	Kendrick
Barbour	Clark	Frazier	King
Barkley	Connally	George	La Follette
Bingham	Coolidge	Glass	Logan
Black	Copeland	Goldsbrough	Long
Borah	Costigan	Gore	McGill
Bratton	Couzens	Grammer	McKellar
Brookhart	Cutting	Harrison	McNary
Bulkeley	Dale	Hayden	Metcalf
Bulow	Davis	Howell	Moses

Neely
Norris
Nye
Oddie
Patterson
Pittman
Reed
Reynolds

Robinson, Ark.
Robinson, Ind.
Russell
Schuyler
Sheppard
Shipstead
Shortridge
Smith

Smoot
Steiwer
Stephens
Swanson
Thomas, Idaho
Thomas, Okla.
Townsend
Trammell

Tydings
Vandenberg
Wagner
Walcott
Walsh, Mass.
Walsh, Mont.
White

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. BLAINE] is unavoidably absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is necessarily absent from the Chamber and from the city because of a death in his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] is necessarily detained on official business, and that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk restated the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMITH. May the amendment be stated before the vote is taken?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated again.

The legislative clerk restated the amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A demand is made for the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to say one word upon the amendment of the Senator from Arizona to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, under the provisions of the bill which I have offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute, each State has a right—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not wish to object; but if the Senator from New York is going to have a minute, then I want a minute.

Mr. MOSES. I will settle the matter, Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BULOW (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT], and withhold my vote.

Mr. LOGAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is absent. I do not know how he would vote on this question, and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MCGILL (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Making the same announcement as before concerning the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. BLAINE], I wish to state that he is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], who is likewise absent. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay" on this question.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (after having voted in the negative). Has the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted?

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. SHEPPARD. I decide to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] are detained on official business, and that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—21

Ashurst	Caraway	Hayden	Smoot
Bankhead	Carey	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Bingham	Dale	Patterson	Trammell
Bratton	Dickinson	Russell	
Byrnes	Fess	Schuyler	
Capper	Fletcher	Sheppard	

NAYS—51

Austin	Cutting	King	Robinson, Ark.
Bayley	Dill	La Follette	Robinson, Ind.
Barbour	Frazier	Long	Shipstead
Barkley	George	McKellar	Steiwer
Black	Glass	McNary	Stephens
Borah	Gore	Metcalf	Townsend
Brookhart	Grammer	Neely	Tydings
Bulkley	Harrison	Norris	Wagner
Clark	Howell	Nye	Walcott
Coolidge	Hull	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Johnson	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Costigan	Kean	Reed	White
Couzens	Kendrick	Reynolds	

NOT VOTING—24

Blaine	Goldsborough	Lewis	Smith
Broussard	Hale	Logan	Swanson
Bulow	Hastings	McGill	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Hatfield	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Davis	Hebert	Schall	Watson
Glenn	Keyes	Shortridge	Wheeler

So Mr. ASHURST's amendment to the amendment of Mr. WAGNER, in the nature of a substitute, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] to the amendment, which will be reported.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Iowa proposes to strike out all of section 6, lines 15 to 25, inclusive, on page 3, all of page 4, and lines 1 to 3 on page 5.

Mr. DICKINSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the substitute of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. A parliamentary inquiry. Are amendments in order, the time having passed when debate is permitted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that amendments are in order, but that no debate is in order. The Senator from Utah will submit his amendment.

Mr. KING. I move to strike out lines 11 and 12, page 6, of the amended substitute. I do not know how else to describe it. The language to be stricken out is as follows:

Subsection (a) of section 201 of such act is further amended by striking out "(other than by taxation)."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COUZENS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COUZENS. Does the RECORD show that all the amendments that were made to the so-called Wagner sub-

stitute are now in the substitute upon which we are asked to vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the RECORD does so show.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the committee, as amended, together with the substitute, as amended, be printed in the RECORD preceding the roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Costigan-La Follette substitute for Senate bill 5125, as amended, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and it is as follows:

That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to cooperate more effectively with the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia in furnishing relief to their needy and distressed people and in relieving the hardship resulting from unemployment.

SEC. 2. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make available out of the funds of the corporation not to exceed \$500,000,000 for payments to the States for emergency relief expenditures and for other expenditures authorized under the provisions of this act, upon certification by the Federal emergency relief board created by section 3.

(b) To enable the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to obtain funds for the purposes of this act, the amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the corporation is authorized and empowered under section 9 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, as amended, to have outstanding at any one time is increased by \$500,000,000.

(c) Ten days after the date upon which a majority of the members of the Federal emergency relief board have qualified and have taken office, no application for funds shall be approved by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the provisions of Title I of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932, and the Federal emergency relief board shall have access to all files and records of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation relating to the administration of emergency relief under Title I of such act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a Federal emergency relief board (referred to in this act as the "board"), which shall consist of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two of whom shall be experienced in public welfare and relief administration. The board shall have full power of apportionment and allotment of funds under the provisions of this act. The President shall designate one of the members of the board as its chairman. The members of the board shall receive no compensation for their services, except that they shall be paid a per diem compensation of \$25 for time devoted to the work of the board, and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, within the limitations prescribed by law for civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government. The board shall cease to exist upon the expiration of two years after the date of the enactment of this act.

(b) The board—

(1) Shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to execute the functions vested in it by this act; and

(2) Shall print monthly for public distribution and shall submit to the President and to the Senate and the House of Representatives (or to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, if those bodies are not in session) a report of its activities and expenditures. Such reports shall, when submitted, be printed as public documents.

(c) The board may appoint and fix the compensation of an executive officer and such experts and, subject to the provisions of the civil service laws, appoint, and, in accordance with the classification act of 1923, as amended, fix the compensation of such other officers and employees as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and may make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere and for printing and binding), not to exceed \$350,000, as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. All expenses of the board shall be paid out of the amount made available for that purpose by section 4 (b).

(d) The board may appoint advisory committees to advise and confer with it with respect to the administration of this act. No salary shall be paid to committee members, but when attending meetings of the board they shall be allowed necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, or per diem allowance in lieu thereof, within the limitations prescribed by law for civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 4. (a) Forty per cent of the amount made available under section 2 (a) of this act shall be apportioned among the States on the basis of population according to the Fifteenth Decennial Census. Payments made in any year out of the amount apportioned to any State on the basis of population shall not be in excess of two-thirds of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for such year by the State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, appropriated by the Congress for use therein), by the civil subdivisions thereof and/or by private contributions from within the State for emergency relief as defined in section 11 of this act.

(b) The balance of the amount made available under section 2 (a) of this act shall be set aside as a reserve fund for emergency

allotments as provided in section 8; except that not to exceed \$350,000 of such balance may be used for administrative expenses of the board under this act which shall be paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation upon presentation of vouchers approved by the Federal emergency relief board.

(c) The amounts apportioned or allotted to any State under this act shall be available for payment to and expenditure by such State, for the purposes of this act, until the expiration of two years after the date of enactment of this act; except that at the expiration of the fiscal year 1933, if the amount certified prior to the expiration of such year for payment to any State out of amounts apportioned on the basis of population under this act is less than one-half of the total amount apportioned to that State on the basis of population, the difference between the amount so certified and one-half of the total amount apportioned shall be added to the reserve fund provided for in subsection (b) of this section and shall be available for allotment to the several States on the basis of need.

Sec. 5. (a) In order to obtain payments out of the amount made available under section 2 (a) of this act a State, through its governor, shall designate or create an agency to cooperate with the board.

(b) Relief shall be administered within each State under rules and regulations adopted by the State agency.

Sec. 6. Any State desiring to obtain funds under this act shall, by the agency designated or created to cooperate with the board, make application therefor from time to time and submit at such times and for such periods as may be prescribed by the board plans for carrying out the provisions of this act within such State. The plans shall include (1) information as to the amounts actually expended for emergency relief by public and private agencies in the State for such periods as the board may prescribe; (2) estimates of the amounts appropriated or otherwise available for emergency relief needs within the State for the period covered by such plan or plans; (3) estimates of amounts necessary to meet the emergency relief needs in the State in the calendar year 1933, and, upon call of the board, in the calendar year 1934; (4) provision for adequate administrative personnel; and (5) provision for securing the benefits contemplated by this act to persons within the State, irrespective of the period of residence within the State. When the board determines that such plans are in conformity with the provisions of this act and reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out its purposes, they shall be approved by the board, and due notice of such approval shall be given to the State agency.

Sec. 7. Within 10 days after the date upon which a majority of the members of the board have qualified and have taken office, the board shall make the apportionment on the basis of population provided in section 4 (a). After application by any State and approval of its plans as provided in section 6 of this act, the board shall immediately certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount to be paid to such State.

Sec. 8. (a) Whenever, from an application presented by a State agency and verified by the board, the board finds that the combined moneys available within the State from all sources, supplemented by any moneys to be paid to the State under section 4 (a), will fall below the estimated needs for emergency relief in any State, the State shall be eligible for an emergency allotment on the basis of need from the reserve fund provided in section 4 (b); but no such allotment shall be made to any State unless the board is satisfied that the State or its political subdivisions have made reasonable efforts within their resources to provide for emergency relief expenditures. The board shall, from time to time, certify the amounts to be paid under this subsection.

(b) The board is authorized to allot to the States not to exceed \$15,000,000 out of the reserve fund, to be used in furnishing relief and in maintaining work and training programs for persons who have no legal claim on the State or the local community for such assistance.

(c) Any State desiring to receive funds under subsection (b) of this section shall submit to the board through its designated relief agency an application which shall set forth, in the manner prescribed by the board, the extent of the need for service to transients, and a detailed plan for administering relief, and for work and training programs, for transients. In considering such application the board shall determine whether sufficient need has been demonstrated, and whether the plans submitted will, if put into effect, actually relieve distress among transients, assist in their rehabilitation, and tend to decrease the transient problem. If the board finds that need has been demonstrated and approves the plan, it shall certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the sum or sums which it approves for payment to the State. For the purpose of this section a transient is a person within the borders of a State who has no legal residence within that State.

Sec. 9. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall make payments without delay to the several States in such amounts and at such times as the Federal Emergency Relief Board may certify under sections 7 and 8 of this act, but no payment shall be made pursuant to certificate which has been revoked by the board as provided in section 10.

Sec. 10. Each State agency cooperating with the board under the provisions of this act shall make such reports concerning its operations and expenditures as shall be prescribed or requested by the board. The board may revoke any existing certificate or withhold any further certificate under this act whenever it shall determine, as to any State, that the State agency has not properly expended or supervised the expenditure of moneys paid to it in accordance with the plans approved under this act. Before any such certi-

ficate shall be revoked or withheld from any State the board shall give notice in writing to the State agency stating specifically wherein the State has failed to comply with such plans.

Sec. 11. The term "emergency relief," when used in this act, means relief in the form of money or commodities or services furnished by the State or its civil subdivisions or by private contributions from within the State to persons in their abode or habitation, or for the transient and homeless, or in the form of wages or other compensation for work furnished on the basis of need, but not including old-age pensions under special acts, or public aid under special acts to mothers for the care of dependent children, or relief to veterans under special acts. The decision of the board as to the purpose of any expenditure shall be final.

Sec. 12. This act shall be construed as intending to secure to the several States control of the administration of relief under this act within their respective territorial limits, subject only to the provisions and purposes of this act.

Sec. 13. The term "State," as used in this act, shall include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; and in the case of the District of Columbia the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall designate the agency to cooperate with the board.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO EMERGENCY RELIEF AND CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1932

Sec. 21. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 201 of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) to make loans to, or contracts with, States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, public agencies of States, of municipalities, and of political subdivisions of States, public corporations, boards and commissions, and public municipal instrumentalities of one or more States, to aid in financing the construction, reconstruction, replacement, extension, or improvement of projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law which, in the opinion of the corporation, are needful and in the public interest, such loans or contracts to be made through the purchase of their securities, or otherwise, and for such purpose the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to bid for such securities: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prohibit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, from purchasing securities having a maturity of more than 10 years."

Sec. —. Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 201 of such act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon a comma and the following:

"and to make loans to finance the construction of housing projects for families of officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, which are self-liquidating in character."

Sec. 22. Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 201 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) to make loans to private corporations to aid in carrying out the construction, replacement, or improvement of bridges, tunnels, docks, viaducts, waterworks, canals, urban water systems, irrigation systems, and markets (including markets for the purpose of buying, selling, warehousing, or storing of agricultural commodities and livestock) devoted to public use and which are self-liquidating in character."

Sec. —. Nothing in subsection (a) of section 201, of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932, shall be held to render ineligible to purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation debentures issued by any State or commission or other agency thereof secured by the pledge of receipts from taxes or other impositions upon or derived from the sale of gasoline, the avails of the sale of such debentures to be devoted exclusively to the improvement of the highways of such State."

Sec. 23. Subsection (a) of section 201 of such act is further amended by striking out "(other than by taxation)."

Sec. 24. Subsections (c) and (d) of section 201 of such act are amended to read as follows:

"(c) In order that the surpluses of agricultural commodities and livestock (including products manufactured directly therefrom) may not have a depressing effect upon current prices of such commodities and products, the corporation is authorized and directed to make loans, in such amounts as may in its judgment be necessary, for the purpose of financing sales of such surpluses in the markets of foreign countries in which such sales can not be financed in the normal course of commerce; but no such sales shall be financed by the corporation if, in its judgment, such sales will affect adversely the world markets for such commodities and products: *Provided, however*, That no such loan shall be made to finance the sale in the markets of foreign countries of cotton owned by the Federal Farm Board or the Cotton Stabilization Corporation.

"(d) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to make loans if adequately secured to bona fide institutions, organized under the laws of any State or of the United States and having resources adequate for their undertakings, for the purpose of enabling them to finance the carrying and orderly marketing of agricultural commodities and livestock produced in the United States, and the products manufactured directly therefrom."

Sec. 25. Subsection (f) of section 201 of such act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "but in determining the adequacy of security offered by a borrower applying under subsection (a) of this section the board may, in its discretion, accept as adequate security under this section, a lien on, or other

satisfactory assurances of the application of, so much of the revenues from the project as may be required to meet interest payments during the period of the loan and assure refunding within a reasonable period: *Provided further*, That each loan made under paragraphs (1) to (5) of subsection (a) of this section after this subsection, as amended, takes effect, shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding 1 per cent more than the rate of interest established for the last issue of bonds of the United States preceding the making of such loan.

Sec. 26. The second proviso of subsection (g) of section 201 of such act is amended by striking out "(1) or (5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1), (2), or (5)."

Sec. 27. Subsection (h) of section 201 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(h) The corporation may make loans under this section at any time prior to January 23, 1934: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the corporation from issuing funds to a borrower prior to January 23, 1939, under the terms of any agreement with the borrower made prior to January 23, 1934."

Sec. 28. Section 201 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make available out of the funds of the corporation a sum not exceeding \$5,000,000, which may be used by the corporation for the purpose of enabling and assisting established credit insurance organizations in the United States to provide export credit guaranties upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the corporation and such credit insurance organizations."

Sec. 29. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 301 of such act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1933" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1934."

At the proper place insert the following:

Sec. —. Section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized and empowered to make loans to any fund created by any State for the purpose of insuring the repayment of deposits of public moneys of such State or any of its political subdivisions in banks or depositories qualified under the law of such State to receive such deposits. Such loans may be made at any time prior to January 23, 1934, and upon such terms and conditions as the corporation may prescribe; except that any fund which receives a loan under this paragraph shall be required to assign to the corporation, to the extent of such loan, all amounts which may be received by such fund as dividends or otherwise from the liquidation of any such bank or depository in which deposits of such public moneys were made. As used in this paragraph, the term 'State' includes the several States, and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, to amend the emergency relief and construction act of 1932, and for other purposes."

The Wagner substitute to Senate bill 5125, as amended and passed, is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 1 of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 is hereby amended by striking out "\$300,000,000" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$600,000,000."

Sec. 2. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 1 of such act is amended by inserting before the words "Puerto Rico" the words "the District of Columbia."

(b) The last sentence of subsection (b) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows: "before any amount is paid under this section to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or to the Governor of Puerto Rico or of the Territory of Alaska, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Territory of Alaska shall enter into an agreement with the corporation for the repayment of such amount with interest thereon as herein provided, in such installments and upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon."

Sec. 3. (a) The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"The governor of any State or Territory may from time to time make application for funds under this section, and in each application so made shall certify the necessity for such funds to supplement the relief resources of the State or Territory, the steps taken by the State or Territory, its political subdivisions, and private agencies, to meet the relief needs of the State or Territory, and the purposes for which the funds requested upon this section will be used."

(b) Subsection (c) of section 1 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No part of the amounts paid to the governor of a State or Territory under this section shall be used for the payment of administrative expenses incurred in furnishing relief and work relief under this section except upon the approval of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and all such expenditures shall be reported to the corporation as often as required by it: *Provided*, That this act shall be construed to permit the governor of a State to use, under

supervision of the State highway department, such loan in the improvement of highways as a part of his work-relief plan."

Sec. 4. Subsection (f) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) As used in this section the term 'Territory' means Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia; and the term 'governor' shall include the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

Sec. 5. Section 1 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) For the purposes of this act, the provisions of section 13 of the act entitled 'An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia,' approved June 11, 1878 (D. C. Code, title 20, ch. 4, sec. 622) (relating to increasing the indebtedness of the District of Columbia), are hereby declared inoperative."

Sec. 6. Such act is further amended by adding after section 1 thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 2. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized and empowered to make available out of funds of the corporation the sum of \$15,000,000, under the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, to the several States and Territories, to be used in furnishing relief and work relief to unemployed and needy transients, and to aid in their rehabilitation in training and work camps, or otherwise. Such sum shall be available for payment to the several States and Territories for the purposes of this section, upon application therefor by them through their governors (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, through the Commissioners of the District of Columbia) or such public relief agencies as the legislatures thereof (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Congress) may designate, and upon approval of such application as hereinafter provided.

"(b) Any State or Territory which desires to receive funds under this section shall set forth in its application the need for such funds, the plan by which it proposes to administer such funds for the relief and rehabilitation of transients, and such other information with respect to its transient problems as the corporation may by regulation prescribe. Upon approval by the corporation of any such application, in whole or in part, it shall make an estimate of the amount needed by the applicant for the purposes of this section for a reasonable period in advance. The amount so estimated shall be immediately paid by the corporation to the proper State or Territorial officials. Each amount so paid shall be considered as an outright grant to the State or Territory receiving the same, but the officials of the State or Territory who administer the amounts received under this section shall file with the corporation a statement of the disbursements made by them for the purposes of this section.

"(c) As used in this section the term 'Territory' means Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia."

Sec. 7. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 201 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) To make loans to, or contracts with, States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, public agencies of States, of municipalities, and of political subdivisions of States, public corporations, boards and commissions, and public municipal instrumentalities of one or more States, to aid in financing the construction, reconstruction, replacement, extension, or improvement of projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law which, in the opinion of the corporation, are needful and in the public interest, such loans or contracts to be made through the purchase of their securities, or otherwise, and for such purpose the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to bid for such securities: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prohibit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, from purchasing securities having a maturity of more than 10 years."

Sec. 8. Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 201 of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon a comma and the following: "and to make loans to finance the construction of housing projects for families of officers of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, which are self-liquidating in character."

Sec. 9. Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 201 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) To make loans to private corporations to aid in carrying out the construction, replacement, or improvement of bridges, tunnels, docks, viaducts, waterworks, canals, urban water systems, irrigation systems, and markets (including markets for the purpose of buying, selling, warehousing, or storing of agricultural commodities and livestock), devoted to public use and which are self-liquidating in character."

Sec. 10. Nothing in subsection (a) of section 201 of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 shall be held to render ineligible to purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation debentures issued by any State or commission or other agency thereof secured by the pledge of receipts from taxes or other impositions upon or derived from the sale of gasoline, the avails of the sale of such debentures to be devoted exclusively to the improvement of the highways of such State.

Sec. 11. Subsection (a) of section 201 of such act is further amended by striking out "(other than by taxation)."

Sec. 12. Subsections (c) and (d) of section 201 of such act are amended to read as follows:

"(c) In order that the surpluses of agricultural commodities and livestock (including products manufactured directly therefrom) may not have a depressing effect upon current prices of such commodities and products, the corporation is authorized

and directed to make loans, in such amounts as may in its judgment be necessary, for the purpose of financing sales of such surpluses in the markets of foreign countries in which such sales can not be financed in the normal course of commerce; but no such sales shall be financed by the corporation if, in its judgment, such sales will affect adversely the world markets for such commodities and products: *Provided, however*, That no such loan shall be made to finance the sale in the markets of foreign countries of cotton owned by the Federal Farm Board or the Cotton Stabilization Corporation.

"(d) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to make loans, if adequately secured, to bona fide institutions, organized under the laws of any State or of the United States and having resources adequate for their undertakings, for the purpose of enabling them to finance the carrying and orderly marketing of agricultural commodities and livestock produced in the United States and the products manufactured directly therefrom."

Sec. 13. Subsection (f) of section 201 of such act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "but in determining the adequacy of security offered by a borrower applying under subsection (a) of this section the board may, in its discretion, accept as adequate security under this section, a lien on, or other satisfactory assurances of the application of, so much of the revenues from the project as may be required to meet interest payments during the period of the loan and assure refunding within a reasonable period: *Provided further*, That each loan made under paragraphs (1) to (5) of subsection (a) of this section after this subsection, as amended, takes effect, shall bear interest at a rate not exceeding 1 per cent more than the rate of interest established for the last issue of bonds of the United States preceding the making of such loan."

Sec. 14. The second proviso of subsection (g) of section 201 of such act is amended by striking out "(1) or (5)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1), (2), or (5)."

Sec. 15. Subsection (h) of section 201 of such act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(h) The corporation may make loans under this section at any time prior to January 23, 1934: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the corporation from issuing funds to a borrower prior to January 23, 1939, under the terms of any agreement with the borrower made prior to January 23, 1934."

Sec. 16. Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 301 of such act is amended by striking out "July 1, 1933" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1934."

Sec. 17. Section 5 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized and empowered to make loans to any fund created by any State for the purpose of insuring the repayment of deposits of public moneys of such State or any of its political subdivisions in banks or depositories qualified under the law of such State to receive such deposits. Such loans may be made at any time prior to January 23, 1934, and upon such terms and conditions as the corporation may prescribe; except that any fund which receives a loan under this paragraph shall be required to assign to the corporation, to the extent of such loan, all amounts which may be received by such fund as dividends or otherwise from the liquidation of any such bank or depository in which deposits of such public moneys were made. As used in this paragraph, the term 'States' includes the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] as amended and as it will appear in the RECORD preceding the vote upon it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. BLAINE's name was called). Making the same announcement as before concerning the absence of my colleague, and the fact that he is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], I wish to announce that if my colleague were present he would vote "nay," and I understand that if the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BULOW (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If the Senator from Rhode Island were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. LOGAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is absent. I do not know how that Senator would vote, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MCGILL (when his name was called). I have a pair on this vote with the junior Senator from New Hampshire

[Mr. KEYES], who is absent. If he were present, I understand he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. If the Senator from Maine were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce a special pair on this question between the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. If the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HATFIELD] were present, he would vote "yea," and if the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] were present he would vote "nay."

I also desire to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY];

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD]; and

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SCHALL]. On this question he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay" on this question, and I am informed that if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. If present, these Senators would vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My colleague [Mr. WHEELER] is absent this afternoon on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—44

Ashurst	Dickinson	King	Smoot
Barbour	Fess	Long	Stelwer
Bingham	Fletcher	McKellar	Stephens
Black	George	McNary	Townsend
Bratton	Glass	Metcalf	Tydings
Bulkey	Gore	Moses	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Oddie	Wagner
Carey	Hayden	Pittman	Walcott
Coolidge	Hull	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Kean	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Kendrick	Russell	White

NAYS—28

Austin	Caraway	Grammer	Patterson
Bailey	Clark	Howell	Reynolds
Bankhead	Costigan	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Barkley	Couzens	La Follette	Sheppard
Borah	Cutting	Neely	Shipstead
Brookhart	Dill	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Frazier	Nye	Trammell

NOT VOTING—24

Blaine	Goldsborough	Lewis	Shortridge
Broussard	Hale	Logan	Smith
Bulow	Hastings	McGill	Swanson
Connally	Hatfield	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Davis	Hebert	Schall	Watson
Glenn	Keyes	Schuyler	Wheeler

So Mr. WAGNER's amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. BLAINE's name was called). Making the same announcement concerning the absence of my colleague [Mr. BLAINE] and his pair, I wish to state that, if present, on this vote he would vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE]. I withhold my vote.

Mr. MCGILL (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES]. If he were present, I understand he would vote as I intend to vote, and therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on account of illness. Were he present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. FESS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HARTFIELD] are necessarily absent, and that if present they would vote "yea."

I also wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; and

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

I also desire to announce the special pair of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL]. If present, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] would vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. If present, these Senators would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—54

Ashurst	Couzens	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.
Bankhead	Cutting	La Follette	Sheppard
Barkley	Dale	Long	Smoot
Black	Dickinson	McGill	Stelwer
Bratton	Dill	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Fess	McNary	Trammell
Bulkeley	Fletcher	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Frazier	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	George	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Harrison	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hayden	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Clark	Howell	Reed	White
Copeland	Hull	Reynolds	
Costigan	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	

NAYS—16

Austin	Borah	Grammer	Patterson
Bailey	Coolidge	Kean	Russell
Barbour	Glass	Metcalf	Townsend
Bingham	Gore	Moses	Walcott

NOT VOTING—26

Blaine	Hale	Logan	Stephens
Broussard	Hastings	Norbeck	Swanson
Bulow	Hatfield	Schall	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Hebert	Schuyler	Watson
Davis	Keyes	Shipstead	Wheeler
Glenn	King	Shortridge	
Goldsborough	Lewis	Smith	

So the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute as amended by the substitute proposed by Mr. WAGNER as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the emergency relief and construction act of 1932."

THE TRANSIENT CAMP

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, a very important contribution toward the solution of the problem we have been discussing to-day has been made at Jacksonville, Fla., by the establishment and successful operation of a transients' camp there. The matter is disclosed in the statement I submit and ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRANSIENT CAMP—AN EXPERIMENT IN SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION

One phase of the problem facing the country as a result of the present economic conditions is that relating to the relief of the thousands of men who are wandering from place to place looking for work.

The extent of the problem is not accurately known, estimates of the number of these wanderers varying from 250,000 to 2,000,000 or more. That it is a problem can not be denied, and it concerns largely thousands of self-respecting men who have hitherto been able to support themselves and their families in comfort, but who now find themselves without work, often without a home, which they may have lost through foreclosure or tax sales, and who are traveling the country over in hopes of obtaining the means of bare subsistence. The professional hoboes, of course, are present in this throng, but their problem is different, and perhaps insoluble. It is the artisan, the former clerk, or small storekeeper whose present situation appeals to our sympathy and calls for a constructive program of relief and rehabilitation.

An attempt has been made to supply such a program in Jacksonville through the establishment of a camp for transients. The Florida National Guard placed at the disposal of the relief committee the barracks and other facilities at Camp Foster, situated about 10 miles from the city, and in consideration of such use it was agreed that the men housed in the camp would be employed in making improvements on the camp reservation, which consists of 1,000 acres. The cooperation of the mayor and the city police department was enthusiastically proffered, so that after the camp was established a man on pass from the camp was not molested, but those without passes were advised to go to the camp or run the risk of being considered vagrants and subject to arrest.

Funds were provided by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and two former service men who were without jobs were employed to operate the camp. Cots and blankets were obtained from the Army. Arrangements were made with the Salvation Army to have men gather at their building and at 9 o'clock every night trucks were sent to get these men and carry them to the camp.

From the beginning it was decided to eliminate red tape, but since this was to be a work camp, men whose physical condition or age precluded them from doing any kind of work were not admitted. A certain number of elderly men were given clerical or other work suited to their age, but since such positions are limited, only a small number were allowed to enter.

No time limit is placed on the length of stay. On admission, however, the applicant is told that he will be expected to remain at least one week, but he may stay indefinitely as long as he behaves himself. The rules are simple and are largely made and enforced by the men themselves. The possession or use of liquor is prohibited. Orderly conduct is required at all times. Seven hours is given to work daily except Sunday, and Saturday afternoon is a holiday. The camp is operated on a semimilitary plan, order and discipline being enforced by sergeants selected by the camp commander from the ex-service men who applied for admission. The cooking is done by former Army cooks, the store-room is in charge of a former groceryman, the camp dispensary in charge of a former Army Hospital Corps man who has had in addition three years in a medical school. Each man is allowed the use of two blankets, a towel, and a pair of overalls, the latter obtained from the Red Cross. They are served a balanced Army ration of three meals a day and are paid 5 cents a day.

On admission each man is questioned separately. His name, his age, his home address, if any, and his occupation are entered on a card and he is told what is expected of him and that the camp is his camp and that he must do his part to keep it the kind of a place he would like to live in. He is then sent to take a hot shower bath, at which time a physical examination is made of his person and his clothes. The latter, if vermin infested, are disinfected and the man assigned to the receiving barracks, where he remains until danger of contamination is passed.

The camp population has grown from 18 on December 16, the opening day, to 418 on February 13, when this is written. During that time 392 men have passed through the camp, many leaving voluntarily, others being dismissed for various reasons. Among this group, coming from all parts of the United States, there have been clerks, cooks, accountants, architects, engineers, machinists, electricians, plumbers, carpenters, auto mechanics, farmers, fishermen, telegraphers, railroad trainmen, prize fighters, sailors, tailors, barbers, common laborers, and a sprinkling of college graduates who find themselves at a loose end in a world that can not provide a living to a skilled artisan, much less to a man without a trade. They range in age from 15 to 70, and they all want a job. The loafer and the bad actor, both of whom

are in a very small minority, do not remain. Usually they leave voluntarily; sometimes the other men tell them to leave.

This story is called an experiment in social reconstruction. Let me explain that. In the first place, so far as possible, the men are given work in their own trade. The farmers have planted and are cultivating a truck farm which will furnish fresh vegetables to the camp mess. The barbers cut the men's hair. The shoemakers and tailors repair shoes and clothes. The electricians and linemen are replacing rotting poles with new poles cut on the reservation and are renovating the entire electrical equipment.

The automobile mechanics have repaired and put into operation many old trucks dating from war time and have made them available for use by the State military department. Since the camp is located on the St. Johns River, even the fishermen have found it possible to follow their vocation and have built themselves a boat from scrap lumber and are catching fish, which they keep in a live trap until enough are accumulated for a meal for 370 men. The prize fighters entertain their companions once a week with a boxing match, and the musicians have formed an orchestra. On Sunday afternoons religious services are held, attendance at which is not compulsory, but a very large majority of the camp population is present at these services. The older men give instruction to the youngsters, vocational training which fits them to become self-supporting when jobs again become available. Then, again, many of these men have been enabled to obtain work because they had a place where mail could reach them. Did you ever think what it would mean not to know where you would be to-morrow? These men might be picked up as vagrants and spend the night in jail, only to be turned loose the next day and told to move on, and have the process repeated the next day.

Then, again, I say it is an experiment in social reconstruction, because these men have shown a spirit of cooperation; yes, enthusiasm, of helpfulness to each other, of willingness to work for what they receive, that shows they have recovered their self-respect and have demonstrated a cheerfulness and hopefulness for the future that is astonishing under the circumstances.

Certain theorists have expressed the conviction that it would be harmful and demoralizing to have boys in association with older men in such a camp. Our experiences at Camp Foster is the contrary. The younger men and boys are getting vocational training from the older skilled workmen, and because discipline in this camp is largely self-imposed the influence of the older, settled men is distinctly beneficial. There is no guard-house at Camp Foster. There is no need for one. There has been no disorder, no infractions of the civil or criminal laws, not one single article loaned to the men has been lost or stolen during the three months the camp has been formed.

There are many problems connected with transients which Camp Foster does not even attempt to solve. The transient family, the aged, the physically disabled, still await some solution of their troubles. Perhaps the young boys might be better helped in other ways, but our experience indicates that the numbers of the latter in the army of the wanderers has been greatly exaggerated. But we do think we are doing something for the great numbers of fine, self-respecting American citizens whose present plight is caused solely by inability to find a job, and that while they are waiting for better times we are preserving their self-respect, their respect for constituted authority, and allowing to them an opportunity to demonstrate a spirit of cooperation and mutual consideration which is a heartening augury for the future.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 211) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC RECOVERY (H. DOC. NO. 560)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, and it was read, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

There are certain measures looking to the promotion of economic recovery which have been under consideration by the Congress and are so advanced toward completion or understanding as to seem possible of enactment during the present session.

1. It is most necessary that the principles of the bankruptcy bill which has already been acted upon by the House should be passed by the Senate. The whole object of the bill is to secure orderly cooperation between creditors and debtors, whether farmers, individuals, general corporations, or railroads, for mutual adjustment which will preserve the integrity and continuous operation of business, save the values of good will and the continuation of people in their occupations, and thus avoid destruction of the interest of

both parties. This legislation is of the most critical importance in this period of readjustment. Incidentally, such a workable system is highly necessary in order to permit a certain minority of railroads to be so reorganized as to reduce fixed charges and thus relieve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of drains in prevention of destructive receiverships.

2. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway treaty should be ratified. It not only will serve a great national purpose but is of importance now also to relieve unemployment by its construction.

3. The enactment by the House of the general principles embodied in the Glass banking bill, which has already passed the Senate, will greatly contribute to reestablish confidence. It is the first constructive step to remedy the prime weakness of our whole economic life—that is, organization of our credit system.

4. Authority should be given to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to increase the amount of loans to States and municipalities for purposes of assistance to distress on the same terms as the present act. While the corporation has funds available which will last until July, it is desirable that they should be supplemented.

5. It seems clear that the domestic-allotment plan is wholly unworkable. It will do far greater harm than good to agriculture.

Pending the return of the great commercial countries to the gold standard and the consequent increase in world consumption, and thus rise in world prices, it is essential temporarily to reduce farm production so as to remove the back-breaking surpluses of agricultural products and thus to raise agricultural income. The plan proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture some time since for temporary leasing of marginal lands is the least harmful and the most hopeful of all the plans which have been proposed. It has the merit of direct action in reducing supply to demand and thus unquestionably increasing prices; it would affect all farm products; give equal benefits to all farmers; is free of increased bureaucracy; very much less costly; and could be covered by a manufacturers' excise tax of probably 1 per cent to 2 per cent upon these commodities. It would also largely eliminate the tax and interest problems which the Congress is seeking to solve at much greater cost.

6. I earnestly recommend repeal of the procedure of the House of Representatives in publishing loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. These transactions should be open to the fullest degree to the representatives of the Congress, but their publication in the last few months has led to widespread, mostly innocent misinterpretation, vicious in effect, by depositors and alarmists who do not recognize that such borrowings represent an endeavor of the institution to provide funds needed in service to their respective communities. This publication is destroying the usefulness and effectiveness of the Reconstruction Corporation, is exaggerating fears, and is introducing new elements of grave danger. It is drying up the very sources of credit. The effect of such publication is forcing payment by distressed debtors to replenish bank funds. It is causing the hoarding of currency.

7. While the Congress could not enact such a law during this session I recommend that it should institute an inquiry with view to the early expansion of the home loan discount banks into a general mortgage discount system to be owned cooperatively by banks and mortgage companies (with adequate encouragement of the special activities of building and loan associations) and thus to parallel in the field of long-time credit the service of the Federal reserve system for short-time credit. Such a system would relieve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of many of its functions, would assist in the orderly readjustment of the present situation, and through private initiative would serve many purposes for which the Congress is striving through direct action by the Government.

8. Peace would be promoted and the killing of men checked in various parts of the world to-day, if the Execu-

tive had the authority to join with other nations in preventing the shipment of arms to such localities. I earnestly recommend that the legislation proposed for this purpose be enacted.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 20, 1933.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 1310, House bill 14359, to amend the bankruptcy act.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is necessarily absent. It was his wish that the bill be made the unfinished business. I hope the motion will prevail.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14359) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] desires to call up the independent offices appropriation bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Chair lays before the Senate the following bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 14458) making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1933, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art love in its tenderest form, let go that precious consolation, "Thy sins are forgiven thee." Draw aside the veil and enable us to perceive the divine compassion and the all-sufficiency of Thy holy will. Speak in the whispers of that peace which comforts the heart of a child. Our citizens of every section, abide with them in great measures of material and spiritual blessings. Strengthen our fellowship, instruct us by Thy teachings, and become to us a light on our pathway. Thou God of all peoples and of all lands, set in motion divine influences that shall flow like ocean tides around the world until all shall be bathed in their floods and the knowledge of the Lord shall fill the earth as the waters cover the sea. Through Christ our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 18, 1933, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the

following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 5122. An act to provide for the purchase and sale of cotton under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 14199) entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REED, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. STEIWER, Mr. CUTTING, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. FLETCHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL—FISCAL YEAR 1934

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 13520) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, and in this connection I would ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes for the purpose of explaining the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the report is not coming up to-day?

Mr. BYRNS. No; but I want to make an explanatory statement of about five minutes, and I think the statement will be of interest to every Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, this report contains, of course, a report upon the amendments which have been made to the appropriations carried in the regular appropriation bill. It was necessary, under the rules of the House, for the conferees to return the other amendments to the House for its action, because they are filled with legislation. I refer particularly to the so-called economy amendment of the Senate and also to the reorganization provision, both of which are contained in the same amendment. There are also two other amendments that it is not necessary to refer to.

Your committee of conference has been in steady and almost continuous session with the Senate since last Monday morning. It took us the entire week to go through this very long amendment and consider it carefully, as we endeavored to do.

We agreed on many things. There are some things to which we did not agree.

I think I may say for the conferees that we were exceedingly anxious, even though some of us may have favored some matters not contained in the motion I will present, to report a bill which would not provoke a discussion, if I may say so, at the other end of the Capitol and probably jeopardize the passage of the bill between now and March 4, or to put into the bill any amendment which might possibly provoke a veto. For this reason members of the conference committee probably did not insist upon some things that they would have insisted upon had it not been for this fact, and also the feeling that later on, if it is desired to amend the measure, there will be no trouble at the next session of Congress in bringing the matter to the attention of the Congress.

The amendment which I will submit represents the views of the House conferees as a majority. There are some members of the conference committee who do not agree to every particular provision in this amendment, but the amendment represents the views of the majority.

I am perfectly well aware that in a long amendment like this it will be impossible for any Member of the House to hear it read from the desk and fully understand all of its provisions.

I have always believed that notwithstanding this is a large membership and notwithstanding the fact that we have to have rules in order to do business, there is no

reason why every Member of the House should not have an opportunity to express himself upon major matters as they come before the House, even though to a limited extent, and it is my desire that every Member of the House shall have an opportunity to-morrow to offer any amendment that is germane to the motion that I shall make, and have the House vote upon it. Therefore, we have prepared our motion and in order to give the House the fullest information at the earliest opportunity as to what we are going to propose, I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD along with this report, and I wish also to advise the House that copies of the amendment will be available after 1 or 2 o'clock this afternoon in the Committee on Appropriations, so that you can see the motion and not have to wait until in the morning to look it over.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The amendment which will be offered reads as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. BYRNS to Senate amendment No. 14, Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, fiscal year 1934 (H. R. 13520): A motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 14, and agree to the same with the following amendment: Strike out all of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and insert the following:

"Sec. 4. (a) The provisions of the following sections of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, are hereby continued in full force and effect during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, namely, sections 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107 (except paragraph (5) of subsection (a) thereof), 108, 109, 112, 201, 203, 205, 206 (except subsection (a) thereof), 211, 214, 216, 304, 315, 317, 318, and 323 and, for the purpose of continuing such sections in the application of such sections with respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the figures '1933' shall be read as '1934'; the figures '1934' as '1935'; and the figures '1935' as '1936'; and, in the case of sections 102 and 203, the figures '1932' shall be read as '1933,' except that in the application of such sections with respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934 (but not with respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933), the following amendments shall apply:

"(1) Section 104 (a) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following: 'and (12) special delivery messengers in the Postal Service'; and section 105 (d) (2) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'special delivery messengers in the Postal Service, but in the case of such messengers, the sum of \$400 shall not be included in the calculation of the rate of their compensation for the purposes of this title';

"(2) Section 106 is amended by striking out 'except judges whose compensation may not under the Constitution be diminished during their continuance in office' and inserting in lieu thereof 'except judges whose compensation prior to retirement or resignation could not under the Constitution have been diminished.'

"(3) Section 216 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided further, That no employee under the classified civil service shall be furloughed under the provisions of this section for a total of more than 90 days during the fiscal year 1934, except after full and complete compliance with all the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations relating to reductions in personnel.'

"(4) Section 317 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: 'Provided further, That no part of any appropriation for "public works," nor any part of any allotment or portion available for "public works" under any appropriation, shall be transferred pursuant to the authority of this section to any appropriation for expenditure for personnel unless such personnel is required upon or in connection with "public works." "Public works" as used in this section shall comprise all projects falling in the general classes enumerated in Budget Statement No. 9, pages A177 to A182, inclusive, of the Budget for the fiscal year 1934, and shall also include the procurement of new airplanes and the construction of vessels under appropriations for "Increase of the Navy." The interpretation by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or by the President in the cases of the War Department and the Navy Department, of "public works," as defined and designated herein, shall be conclusive.'

"(b) All acts or parts of acts inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of such sections, as amended, are hereby suspended during the period in which such sections, as amended, are in effect.

"(c) No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction of any suit against the United States or (unless brought by the United States) against any officer, agency, or instrumentality of the United States arising out of the application, as provided in this section, of such sections 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, or 112, as amended, unless such suit involves the Constitution of the United States.

"(d) The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of the amendments made in subsection (a) of this section shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

"(e) Each permanent specific annual appropriation available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, is hereby reduced for that fiscal year by such estimated amount as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may determine will be equivalent to the savings that will be effected in such appropriation by reason of the application of this section and section 7.

"Sec. 5. Effective the first day of the month next following the passage of this act, in the application of Title I of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, and section 4 of this act, in any case where the annual rate of compensation of any position is in excess of \$1,000, the provisions reducing compensation shall not operate to reduce the total amount paid for any month to any incumbent of any such position unless the total amount earned by such incumbent in such month exceeds \$83.33: *Provided*, That any such reduction made in any case where the total amount earned by any such incumbent in any month exceeds \$83.33 shall not operate to reduce the total amount to be paid to such incumbent for such month to less than \$83.33.

"Sec. 6. (a) Sections 103 and 215 of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, shall be held applicable to the officers and employees of the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Co. on the Isthmus of Panama, and to officers and employees of the United States (including enlisted personnel) holding official station outside the continental United States, only to the extent of depriving each of them of one month's leave of absence with pay during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1933, and June 30, 1934.

"(b) During the fiscal year 1934, deductions on account of legislative furlough shall be made each month from the compensation of each officer or employee subject to the furlough provisions of Title I of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, as continued by section 4 (a) of this act, at the rate of 8½ per cent per month regardless of the number of days of such furlough actually taken by any such officer or employee in any month.

"Sec. 7. No administrative promotions in the civil branch of the United States Government or the government of the District of Columbia shall be made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934: *Provided*, That the filling of a vacancy, when authorized by the President, by the appointment of an employee of a lower grade, shall not be construed as an administrative promotion, but no such appointment shall increase the compensation of such employee to a rate in excess of the minimum rate of the grade to which such employee is appointed, unless such minimum rate would require an actual reduction in compensation: *Provided further*, That the restoration of employees to their former grades or their advancement to intermediate grades following reductions of compensation for disciplinary reasons shall not be construed to be administrative promotions for the purposes of this section. The provisions of this section shall not apply to commissioned, commissioned warrant, and enlisted personnel, and cadets, of the Coast Guard.

"Sec. 8. All officers and employees of the United States Government or of the government of the District of Columbia who had reached the retirement age prescribed for automatic separation from the service on or before July 1, 1932, and who were continued in active service for a period of less than 30 days after June 30, 1932, pursuant to an Executive order issued under authority of section 204 of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, shall be regarded as having been retired and entitled to annuity beginning with the day following the date of separation from active service, instead of from August 1, 1932, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to make payments accordingly from the civil-service retirement and disability fund.

"Sec. 9. The allowance provided for in the act entitled 'An act to permit payments for the operation of motor cycles and automobiles used for necessary travel on official business, on a mileage basis in lieu of actual operating expenses,' approved February 14, 1931 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 73a), for travel ordered after the date of enactment of this act shall not exceed 2 cents per mile in the case of travel by motor cycle or 5 cents per mile in the case of travel by automobile.

"Sec. 10. Whenever by or under authority of law actual expenses for travel may be allowed to officers or employees of the United States, such allowances, in the case of travel ordered after the date of enactment of this act, shall not exceed the lowest first-class rate by the transportation facility used in such travel.

"Sec. 11. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the provisions of the act of March 3, 1931 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 26a), shall not apply to any employees of the Veterans' Administration homes, hospitals, or combined facilities where, in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the public interest requires that such employees should be excepted from the provisions thereof. As to those employees excepted from the provisions of the act of March 3, 1931, seven hours shall constitute a workday on Saturday and labor in excess of four hours on Saturdays shall not entitle such employees to an equal shortening of the workday on some other day or to additional compensation therefor.

"Sec. 12. Assignments of officers of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to permanent duty in the Philippines, on the Asiatic Station, or in China, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Panama Canal Zone shall be for not less than three years. No such officer shall be transferred to duty in the continental United States before the expiration of such period unless the health of such officer or the public interest requires such transfer, and the reason for the transfer shall be stated in the order directing such transfer.

"SEC. 13. The act entitled 'An act to provide for deducting any debt due the United States from any judgment recovered against the United States by such debtor,' approved March 3, 1875 (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 227), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That when any final judgment recovered against the United States duly allowed by legal authority shall be presented to the Comptroller General of the United States for payment, and the plaintiff therein shall be indebted to the United States in any manner, whether as principal or surety, it shall be the duty of the Comptroller General of the United States to withhold payment of an amount of such judgment equal to the debt thus due to the United States; and if such plaintiff assents to such set-off, and discharges his judgment or an amount thereof equal to said debt, the Comptroller General of the United States shall execute a discharge of the debt due from the plaintiff to the United States. But if such plaintiff denies his indebtedness to the United States, or refuses to consent to the set-off, then the Comptroller General of the United States shall withhold payment of such further amount of such judgment as in his opinion will be sufficient to cover all legal charges and costs in prosecuting the debt of the United States to final judgment. And if such debt is not already in suit, it shall be the duty of the Comptroller General of the United States to cause legal proceedings to be immediately commenced to enforce the same, and to cause the same to be prosecuted to final judgment with all reasonable dispatch. And if in such action judgment shall be rendered against the United States, or the amount recovered for debt and costs shall be less than the amount so withheld as before provided, the balance shall then be paid over to such plaintiff by such Comptroller General of the United States with 6 per cent interest thereon for the time it has been withheld from the plaintiff."

"Sec. 14. Section 319 of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, is repealed as of June 30, 1932; and the rate of interest to be allowed upon judgments against the United States and overpayments in respect of internal-revenue taxes shall be the rate applicable thereto prior to the enactment of section 319 of such act."

"Sec. 15. All laws providing for permanent specific annual appropriations are hereby modified so that, after June 30, 1934, in lieu of the appropriations made therein, the sums available for the purposes of such laws shall be such sums (not exceeding the amounts now provided in such laws) as may hereafter be provided therefor from time to time by Congress."

"Sec. 16. Section 322 of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, is amended by adding at the end of the section the following proviso: 'Provided further, That the provisions of this section as applicable to rentals shall apply only where the rental to be paid shall exceed \$2,000 per annum.'"

"Sec. 17. Title IV of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE IV—REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

"DECLARATION OF STANDARD

"SEC. 401. The Congress hereby declares that a serious emergency exists by reason of the general economic depression; that it is imperative to reduce drastically governmental expenditures; and that such reduction may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding immediately under the provisions of this title."

"Accordingly, the President shall investigate the present organization of all executive and administrative agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(a) To reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(b) To increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

"(c) To group, coordinate, and consolidate executive and administrative agencies of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(d) To reduce the number of such agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and by abolishing such agencies and/or such functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government;

"(e) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort; and

"(f) To segregate regulatory agencies and functions from those of an administrative and executive character."

"DEFINITION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY

"SEC. 402. When used in this title, the term 'executive agency' means any commission, independent establishment, board, bureau, division, service, or office in the executive branch of the Government and, except as provided in section 403, includes the executive departments."

"POWER OF PRESIDENT

"SEC. 403. Whenever the President, after investigation, shall find and declare that any regrouping, consolidation, transfer, or abolition of any executive agency or agencies and/or the functions thereof is necessary to accomplish any of the purposes set forth in section 401 of this title, he may by Executive order—

"(a) Transfer the whole or any part of any executive agency and/or the functions thereof to the jurisdiction and control of any other executive agency;

"(b) Consolidate the functions vested in any executive agency; or

"(c) Abolish the whole or any part of any executive agency and/or the functions thereof; and

LXXVI—284

"(d) Designate and fix the name and functions of any consolidated activity or executive agency and the title, powers, and duties of its executive head; except that the President shall not have authority under this title to abolish or transfer an executive department and/or all the functions thereof."

"SEC. 404. The President's order directing any transfer, consolidation, or elimination under the provisions of this title shall also make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property (including office equipment), and personnel, affected by such transfer, consolidation, or elimination. In any case of a transfer or consolidation under the provisions of this title, the President's order shall also make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with the function or agency transferred or consolidated, as he deems necessary by reason of the transfer or consolidation, for use in connection with the transferred or consolidated function or for the use of the agency to which the transfer is made or of the agency resulting from such consolidation."

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 405. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of any executive agency or function transferred or consolidated with any other executive agency or function under the provisions of this title, and in effect at the time of the transfer or consolidation, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer or consolidation had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed."

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any executive agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of any transfer of authority, power, and duties from one officer or executive agency of the Government to another under the provisions of this title, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the head of the executive agency or other officer of the United States to whom the authority, powers, and duties are transferred."

"(c) All laws relating to any executive agency or function transferred or consolidated with any other executive agency or function under the provisions of this title, shall, in so far as such laws are not inapplicable, remain in full force and effect, and shall be administered by the head of the executive agency to which the transfer is made or with which the consolidation is effected."

"WINDING UP AFFAIRS OF AGENCIES

"SEC. 406. In the case of the elimination of any executive agency or function, the President's order providing for such elimination shall make provision for winding up the affairs of the executive agency eliminated or the affairs of the executive agency with respect to the functions eliminated, as the case may be."

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER

"SEC. 407. Whenever the President makes an Executive order under the provisions of this title, such Executive order shall be submitted to the Congress while in session and shall not become effective until after the expiration of 60 calendar days after such transmission, unless Congress shall by law provide for an earlier effective date of such Executive order or orders: *Provided*, That if Congress shall adjourn before the expiration of 60 calendar days from the date of such transmission such Executive order shall not become effective until after the expiration of 60 calendar days from the opening day of the next succeeding regular or special session."

"APPROPRIATIONS IMPOUNDED

"SEC. 408. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this title shall not be used for any purpose but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury."

"TERMINATION OF POWER

"SEC. 409. The authority granted to the President under section 403 shall terminate upon the expiration of two years after the date of enactment of this act unless otherwise provided by Congress."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Two hundred and ninety-one gentlemen present, a quorum.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is coming up to-morrow and what is the reason for this request?

The SPEAKER. The conference report just referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 211) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and agree to the same.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"Sec. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"Sec. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DYER. I demand a second.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. It is impossible for Democrats over on this side to get any time to oppose this repeal resolution from the majority leader, who has moved to pass it under suspension of rules, and it is necessary to have some one demand a second who is against it, and who will yield his time to the opposition, and we will have only 20 minutes' debate to the side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have some one against it when the Member qualifies.

Mr. DYER. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Missouri opposed to the resolution?

Mr. DYER. I am not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. I am opposed to the resolution.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if it is his purpose to divide the time between those in favor and those opposed, or will he yield to those only who are in favor of the resolution?

Mr. RAINEY. I am going to yield only to those who are for the resolution, but I intend to yield to gentlemen on that side.

Mr. SNELL. And the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MOORE, will yield time to those opposed to the resolution?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. BLANTON. There is no question of objection. I make a point of order. I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, a second has been demanded, and it takes unanimous consent to agree that the second shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOORE] for 20 minutes.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to discuss this resolution except to quote from a speech made by the proponent of prohibition, Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, in the Senate, July 30, 1917, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 5553 and 5554, in which he states among other statements—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois has no right to attack a Senator on the floor of the House.

Mr. RAINEY. I am not attacking any Senator, I am approving of what he said.

Mr. RANKIN. It is an indirect attack, and he can not read from the Senate proceedings.

The SPEAKER. The point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi is well taken. Speaker Longworth held in an elaborate ruling that a Member of the House could not refer to a Senator and quote what he said. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. Has not a Member a right to quote anything that a Senator said?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just ruled on that.

Mr. RAINEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I say this on my own responsibility. I would vote to submit any amendment to the States in order to preserve the right of petition, and for that reason I am voting for this. I voted for the submission of the five amendments which have been added to the Constitution since I have been a Member of this House.

During my period of service here I have voted to submit to the States every amendment which seemed to have the support of any considerable bloc of people. I have already voted to submit five amendments, the income-tax amendment, the amendment providing for the direct election of Senators, the prohibition amendment—the eighteenth—the woman's suffrage amendment, and the lame-duck amendment, and I expect to vote now to submit this amendment.

I refuse to stand in the gateway in an attempt to prevent the people of the United States from amending their own Constitution in the way provided by the Constitution itself. I am not arrogant enough to do that.

A Member of this House is not voting wet or dry when he votes to submit this amendment. He is simply conceding to the States the right of petition and enormous petitions have been filed here for the resubmission of this amendment. There seem to be a great many people in the United States who would like to see the Federal Government obtain as revenue the profits now made by bootleggers, and I must confess that personally I sympathize with them in the position they take, and this Government certainly needs revenue. At the present time we are borrowing just half the amount it costs to run this Government. This can not go on forever. We are going to reach the end of our borrowing power sooner than some people think. Every time we borrow five hundred million or a billion dollars we are in effect mortgaging all the homes and all the farms in every State in this Union for that amount of money, and we are placing a mortgage on them which must be paid in advance of the mortgages these owners have been compelled to place on their property, and unwillingly compelled to place there. Every dollar of profit in this country is pledged to the payment of the immense sums we are adding now to the national debt.

I know what the rules of this House are. I can not quote here what has been said on the floor of another body, but, of course, what has been said there can not be changed and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS disclose it all. I, however, desire now to appropriate the language of a very prominent prohibition leader as my own, and I simply make this statement in order to show that the quotation I am now making is not my own language so that I can relieve myself of the charge of plagiarism. I now read the following statement into the RECORD:

* * * The Member of Congress who will not vote for the submission of a constitutional amendment to the decision of the States, where it belongs, unless he personally believes it should become a part of the Constitution, usurps the function of the States, arrogates to himself and the Federal Government a prerogative that belongs to the States and violates the very essence of their sovereignty. Furthermore, over 12,000,000 of the American people have petitioned Congress to submit the prohibition amendment to the States. In refusing these people the right to appeal to the only tribunal having the power of amendment—the tribunal of the States—for the redress of what they consider one of the most terrible grievances in the Republic, Congress would

deny to them one of the most sacred of all popular rights—the right of petition. Were I opposed on principle to nation-wide prohibition I would vote to submit the amendment to the States in order that they might exercise one of their fundamental rights. An issue is thus presented by the nation-wide amendment entirely independent of prohibition, and that issue is expressed in two questions:

(1) Shall Senators and Representatives in Congress, either wholly or partly, substitute themselves for the States as the amending power of the Constitution, thereby centralizing sovereignty at Washington to a degree threatening the extinction of the State?

(2) Shall they refuse the people the right of petition?

Senator GEORGE, of Mississippi, a vigorous and outspoken anti-prohibitionist, was a member of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred a national prohibition amendment some 40 years ago. He joined in a favorable report for its submission on the ground that to do otherwise would be to deny to millions of people the right of petition. * * *

* * * At the close of this debate we will have an opportunity to enable the States to exercise their highest function—the right to shape, alter, and develop the Federal Constitution. They are the proper tribunal to decide the fate of this amendment. They compose the mightiest array of free Commonwealths united in a federated whole the world has ever seen. There are chapters in the history of each that add honor to American citizenship. If there is anything in the amendment subversive of their liberties and their welfare, they can be trusted to condemn it. Let not Congress assume to judge for them. Let Congress discharge its preliminary task of submission and stand aside. Let it put in motion the referendum provided by the Nation's organic law—the method of amendment the States themselves established when they created the Constitution. Let the States perform the duty which remains the sole instance of their sovereignty over the Federal Government itself. If the State and Nation may each retain the attributes contemplated in the Constitution, if each shall be kept within its sphere and permitted to perform its appointed agency, the most beneficent system of government yet devised will be strengthened and glorified for all time.

As I view the matter, the Member of either branch of the American Congress who denies the power of amendment to the States, especially an amendment which vast numbers of the people desire the States to consider, violates the basic principles both of the Constitution and of popular government, repudiates the fundamental rights of the States, and overturns the two most sacred privileges the people possess, the privileges of referendum and of petition.

In conclusion, I desire to say that I hope this amendment will pass. It will take three-fourths of the States to ratify it. Opposition to its passage now by prohibition leaders shows a decided weakness on their part. Framers of the Constitution have provided that it is not easily changed and can only be changed by three-fourths of the States, and if three-fourths of the States want to amend the Constitution they have the right to do so. If this amendment is adopted the question will be remitted to the States in compliance with the provisions of the Constitution, and the States will have the right to amend, to reject, or to adopt it in the manner provided by the Constitution itself.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, is it in order now that each Member may have five legislative days in which to extend his own remarks?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Maine. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the success or failure of national prohibition is of peculiar interest to the people of my State. It was in Maine some 87 years ago that the first prohibitory law ever enacted was placed upon our statute books. In 1884 it was written into our State constitution. Since I came to manhood and cast my first vote I have seen going on in Maine the same struggle as regards prohibition, resubmission, and repeal that is to-day being enacted on a larger scale in the Nation. For 27 years before coming to this Congress I voted dry, voted against the money and efforts of out-of-State liquor organizations to nullify our State laws, voted for what I believed and still believe to be for the best interests of the homes of Maine and the women and children of my State. For 11 years as a Member of this House I have voted to

support and enforce the eighteenth amendment. My convictions remain unchanged.

I realize, of course, that I am one of a very definite minority, and that the result of the coming vote is a foregone conclusion. The Republican leaders of this House are supporting this resolution, which to my mind does violence to a solemn promise made to the people of this country in our party platform, while the Democratic leaders have had recourse to arbitrary caucus methods seeking to override the very consciences of their members. Nevertheless, I make this prediction: That the experience of Maine will be the experience of the Nation, and that unless some definite assurance against the return of the saloon is given to the American people no Member of this House will live to see national prohibition wiped from the pages of the Federal Constitution. [Applause.]

The great danger, however, as all must realize, lies in the breakdown of enforcement and the nullification of law that is already foreshadowed and bound to exist during the years of the interregnum between the passage of this resolution and its final disposition. The recent election was an economic revolution, a demand on the part of the people, not for rum, but for better economic and social conditions. That demand has not yet been met, nor will this resolution meet it. It is a poor time to encourage lawlessness or to let loose a flood of intoxicating liquor on a mechanized world seething with social unrest.

Futile as it may be, little as I may add to this discussion in the few moments allowed me, it does not seem fitting that Members from the original prohibition State should be altogether silent at this time, representing as we do a State that in the past has furnished the world leaders in several great humanitarian movements: William Ladd, in the cause of world peace and a high court of nations; Elijah Parish Lovejoy, a leader and martyr in the cause of freedom of the press; and Neal Dow, the father of prohibition. Standing here in this dark hour, when the friends of prohibition and all that pertains to it seem but few, let me say that I am proud of Gen. Neal Dow as a great Maine citizen, humanitarian, and soldier, and that I take pride in the pioneer prohibition record of my people. Maine came into the Union as a compromise between right and wrong, but the men and women of Maine, as a group, have never yet so compromised. As a humble Member of this House I have sought, in a small way, to maintain the traditions of my State; and while it will never be given to me to lead the forward march of a great cause, yet, God helping me, I do not propose to lead a retreat in this great moral and humanitarian movement. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, there are only two sides to this war. A man ought to be on one side or the other. He ought to be dry or he ought to be wet. I respect the views of any man who thinks the eighteenth amendment ought to be repealed and stands by his convictions. For the man who deep down in his heart does not think it ought to be repealed, and believes that its repeal would endanger every fireside in America, but nevertheless votes for repeal and assigns as his reason the declarations of some delegates to some convention or the action of some party caucus, I have only profound sympathy. No job in the world is worth a sacrifice like that. I pity the man who says that he is going to vote for repeal here and then go home and vote against repeal. He is neither a soldier nor a sailor. He might be a marine, fighting first on water and then on land, except for the fact that the marines are good fighters and are always loyal to one flag. The Bible speaks about him when it says:

Thou art neither hot nor cold; I will spew thee out of my mouth.

But my profoundest commiseration goes out to men who have voted on both sides of this question, and especially to

those who, as lately as last December, voted against repeal and now vote for repeal. There has been no party convention since then. The same platform declarations existed then that exist now. A party caucus may have intervened, but whoever heard of a party caucus being more powerful than a party platform? Will gentlemen who voted "no" in December, despite their party platform, vote "aye" now and attempt to excuse themselves by pointing to a party caucus? The suggestion is absurd.

There are few, if any, men who have won honor by fighting on both sides in any war. The man who says that he is going to vote wet here and then go home and vote dry exhibits a versatility which might have enabled him, if he had been in the World War, to have piloted the Germans through Belgium and then have joined with the Allies in the defense of Paris.

I will not bring the enemy to my people's doorsteps and then undertake to repel him. I will fight him all the way. And neither as a citizen, a Democrat who expects always to be a Democrat, nor as a public servant shall I offer any apology for so doing to any individual on earth, believing, as I do, that I am keeping faith with those who sent me here and whose agent I am.

I shall not "hold with the hare and run with the hound." I shall not sacrifice my convictions upon any altar of alleged party loyalty. The Democratic Party of my fathers is a party of good morals and good government, and I shall do my utmost as an humble member to keep it so. The principles of that party have never required any man to sacrifice his conscientious convictions upon a moral question. If I am true to my people and true to myself, I shall not be untrue to the Democratic Party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LICHTENWALNER].

Mr. LICHTENWALNER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I am very proud to have the opportunity of doing my part here to-day to bring about the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and prohibition. I have no doubt this result will follow within a year if we pass this resolution to-day.

In season and out of season I have fought against the principle involved in the eighteenth amendment, when Congress and the State legislatures amended the Constitution to try to regulate the personal habits of the people and when it invaded their private rights and liberties it wrote into the Constitution what might better have been passed as town ordinances in those communities which desired to be bone dry.

I did not believe at the time that prohibition was passed that it represented the majority will of the people at all, and I think that the results of 13 years of attempted enforcement justify that belief, because no law can be enforced that is against the will of the people.

The Government has been most liberal in appropriating money for enforcement and those of us who are willing to face the facts know the results. Prohibition has not brought about temperance. We know now that it has had the opposite effect. We know that for every saloon that has been eliminated that there have been three speakeasies to replace it. Where local authorities were formerly able to enforce the laws preventing liquor being sold to minors and to intoxicated persons and on Sundays, it is now an undercover business and therefore passed out of control. So that prohibition must now be pronounced a national failure.

But more important and most serious of all is the fact that billions of dollars which would have flowed into the United States Treasury in revenue, and which might have gone to the reduction of taxes and of the public debt, have reverted instead to racketeers and gangsters in most of our cities and have created lawlessness much more serious than the breaking of liquor laws.

So that while I was and am against prohibition in principle, my opinion has been further confirmed by its results; but irrespective of my views, now that the Government

under the present economic conditions needs the revenue so badly, this alone would be sufficient for me to form my opinion regarding it. I therefore hope that this resolution will pass. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GRANFIELD].

Mr. GRANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, as a member of the State Legislature in Massachusetts, I voted against the ratification of the eighteenth amendment. My attitude on this great problem has not changed. I rejoice in the opportunity that is offered to vote for this resolution. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON] a few moments ago in his remarks to the House made some reference to the saloon. I have heard a great deal about the saloon. Every time a dry discusses prohibition he speaks about the return of the saloon. None of them say anything about the speakeasy, with all of its evils, which has taken the place of the saloon. [Applause.]

This talk of the return of the saloon is nothing but subterfuge. A cursory investigation of the conditions as they exist should convince the most ardent dries in this country that their concern should be with the abolition of the present day speakeasy, and not with the possibilities of the return of the saloon. As bad as they claim the saloon was, the speakeasy of to-day, with its attendant evils, is a far more serious problem. Instead of being concerned about the return of the saloon, let these gentlemen suggest ways and means by which we can eliminate the speakeasy from our national life; I am for immediate action of this character.

I regret there is insufficient time for me to discuss this issue further; however, under the right of extension of my remarks, at a later date I shall speak on this problem at length. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before us would decide the policy of a Nation. Within the hour and without opportunity for debate or amendment we must vote for or against the return of the saloon. I am against it. The resolution does not comport with the Republican nor the Democratic platforms. It gives no guarantee against the old-time saloon. This resolution opens wide the door. It will pass to-day because a great political party has bound and gagged its members and prevented the exercise of their individual rights and judgment. Feeding the hungry and solving economic problems are pushed aside.

The home-farm mortgage and high taxes are the twin giants that now grind our people to the quick. This resolution destroys neither of these giants of despair. It feeds both. The free flow of liquor will not lift the mortgage nor reduce taxes for the masses.

Sagging farm-commodity prices and unemployment are of the very essence of our Nation's distress. What is the Congress of the United States doing to-day?

Are we lifting the mortgage?

Are we sheltering the homeless?

Are we employing the millions?

Are we feeding the hungry?

Do we hush the infant's cry for food?

Can you spend a dollar for drink and at the same time spend it for food?

Seriously, can you put dollars into the till of the grocer, the butcher, the department store, the garage, the filling station, and the movies by cashing the pay check in the saloon?

Will the saloon inject lifeblood into languishing agriculture and commerce and industry?

Will the free flow of liquor help men to secure jobs?

Will its unlimited supply help men to house and clothe and feed their wives and helpless children and educate our youth?

This is the machine age. Will liquor make safer our highways and railways and factories?

With what liquors shall our pilots be served before taking the air?

You talk of revenues. Taxes come directly or indirectly from the pockets of the people. I know and you know this is not the sound, unselfish judgment of the American people but the hue and cry of paid propagandists. This is the culmination of a deep-laid plan of heartless millionaires to shift the tax burden from their pockets to the cravings of the helpless.

This is an economic crime you would perpetrate to-day. The free flow of liquor never did and never can solve the problems of this or any other country. Wet Britain and Germany are suffering worse to-day than we.

This hour calls for hope and faith and courage.

This Congress is playing at tweedledum and tweedledee. The farmer and laborer starve while you enrich the brewer and shift the tax burden from the millionaire to the honest toiler.

It should not be. I do not believe the American people will so decree.

Gladstone said:

It is the duty of government to make it easier to do right and harder to do wrong.

We are writing history to-day. To ignore the present and the future is a travesty on statesmanship.

I respect the honest convictions of all men. But let us at this hour recall the words of the immortal Lincoln:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, but with firmness for the right, as God gives us to see the right.

So let us cast our votes this day.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON].

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution provides for an absolute and unqualified repeal of the eighteenth amendment. This may be in accordance with the platform declaration of the Democratic Party, but it is my belief that a majority of the people will not approve, when they come to realize that passage and ratification of this resolution will restore the old order to the liquor traffic.

It was repeatedly stated at the Chicago conventions and seems to be a prevailing sentiment that we do not want a return of the saloon. The majority of those who favor change and modification of our national prohibition laws protest against the open saloon. But, notwithstanding this well-known opposition, we are about to approve a resolution which, if ratified, will return the open saloon, with all its attendant evils, to a large area of our land. When this becomes evident there will be a wave of resentment against this backward step; and I wish to say to you, my friends on the Democratic side of this House who are dry, that it will then be no alibi for you to say that your party platform called for a repeal or your party caucus bound you to vote for a repeal. This involves a moral question which each one should settle according to his or her convictions and is outside of party dictation.

We should reject this resolution to-day and then write one embodying such changes and modifications as the experience of the past 12 years suggests, profiting by that experience and avoiding the evils of the liquor traffic of former days. I venture the prediction now that this repeal resolution will not be ratified by the required number of States. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON] has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, the eminent lexicographer, Noah Webster, defines the word platform as follows: "A declaration of principles on which a group of persons or a party stand, and on which they appeal for support. A declaration of principles and policies of government adopted by a political party."

The Republican Party in its platform adopted in Chicago, June, 1932, favored the submission of this question to the States to be acted upon by State conventions called for that purpose.

The Democratic platform adopted in Chicago, July, 1932, contained the two following paragraphs:

First:

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when intrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe. We hereby declare this should be the platform of the Democratic Party.

Second:

We advocate the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. To effect such repeal we demand that the Congress immediately propose a constitutional amendment to truly representative conventions in the States called to act solely on that proposal.

In the light of the planks in the platforms of the two parties which I have just read, it appears to my mind to be a distinct breach of faith with the people of our country if we fail to vote to-day for the submission of this question. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, if the House passes this resolution to-day, every Republican and every Democrat who votes for it votes not only to repudiate the most solemn and binding pledge of his party platform but also for the return of the saloon, the most sinister influence that ever cursed American life and politics. The final ratification of this proposed amendment insures the return of the saloon. It will be here the moment the thirty-sixth State gives it final approval to this proposed amendment to the Constitution.

Never in the political history of the United States was there such a betrayal of a party-platform pledge. Both the Republican and Democratic platforms contained the most solemn and unequivocal pledge that there should be no return of the saloon. The Republican platform pledged "to safeguard our citizens everywhere from the return of the saloon." The Democratic platform likewise promised "such measures by the several States as will actually promote temperance, effectively prevent the saloon."

Never did parties state in more unequivocal language a more positive position, and never in the political history of this country did congressional party leadership more brazenly violate the pledge of their parties. Does a platform declaration mean nothing to the party leadership in this House? If such a party pledge is thus so violently repudiated, what confidence do we justify in the judgment of the people? Can we complain if they lose confidence in the parliamentary machinery of our country?

What kind of unholy alliance is this between the Republican and Democratic leadership of the House, whose inevitable end is the return of the saloon if this program of repeal is ever carried out? I understand it is based upon the action of the so-called Republican wet bloc. It, no doubt, is inspired by the same type of political wisdom that induced President Hoover to reverse his position from that of 1928. I am sure he yielded with reluctance to the advice of those who urged compromise upon this great moral problem.

He suffered an overwhelming defeat. He probably could not have been elected in such a financial crisis even if he would have stood firm as in 1928, but he would have had the satisfaction of knowing that he was on the right side of a great moral problem. And what a fight the good people of this country would have put up against the boast of Franklin D. Roosevelt, that "from this day the eighteenth amendment is doomed," if they had had the opportunity to express themselves on that question. And what a towering figure these same people would have had to rally around as this wild, wet craze is sweeping the country, a craze that is sure to wane with the reign of booze that is to begin on March 4.

I want here to pay tribute to those Democrats who have refused to be bound by the Democratic caucus, that last relic

of parliamentary slavery in the Congress of the United States. They had the moral courage to stand by their party platform against the return of the saloon. They are right when they declare that their party platform claims a higher fealty than the dictation of a secret caucus. May their tribe increase.

What a contrast is the attitude of the distinguished Speaker who having failed the first hour of this session to jam a naked repeal resolution through the House has now resorted to the secret caucus to force his party in the House to repudiate the platform upon which he was elected both to Congress and to the second highest office in the gift of the Nation. What a tragedy that such a great career in this House should have for its valedictory the betrayal of his party platform and the invitation contained in this resolution for the return of the old saloon with all its evils and abuses.

If one should judge from our actions in this House what was the most important matter for consideration since we met in December, he would be forced to conclude that nothing was important except that the people be given booze to drink. Yet people are hungry and children are crying for food. The farmer was never in such a desperate plight. His farm and property are on the auction block. He is facing bankruptcy. What have we done for him? All we have done thus far is to set before him the mirage and vision of a schooner of ice-cold beer in the dead of winter and a bottle of booze and said "Drink and be damned."

Let no one be deceived concerning the ease with which the eighteenth amendment is going to be repealed. The framers of the Constitution made it difficult to amend and alter. Let no one imagine that submitting this to the States is going to settle it. It is only the opening gun in a battle that will rock your district from center to circumference. It will penetrate every precinct in your district in your campaign in 1934. Then we will answer for our votes to-day.

Vote against this resolution and thus vote against the return of the saloon. Vote for it and condemnation will assail you from a million firesides where little children play. Vote for it and anathemas will thunder from 100,000 pulpits for this base and infamous treason to party platforms. Vote for it and it will kindle fires under you in every precinct in your district in 1934. Vote for it and it will call to the colors of decency and sobriety millions of women who hate the very name of the saloon and who will never consent to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. Vote against it and unborn generations will call you blessed. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield one and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in the last election, in both political parties, there was absolutely no dispute or debate on two propositions. One was the prevention of the return of the saloon and the other was the protection of dry States against wet States. To-day, in the pending resolution, there is not presented for our consideration any prevention of the return of the saloon. I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] if he will not let us, by unanimous consent, insert in this resolution, in line 3, on page 2, after the word "liquors," the words "and the return of the saloon," so that it will include with the new proposed prohibition of "transportation and importation of intoxicating liquors," the prevention of the return of the saloon in any State or Territory in violation of the laws thereof.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] should be good enough sport not to interrupt the gentleman in a 1½-minute speech.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. RAINEY. I will not make that request. This resolution has passed the Senate. It comes up now before the House on motion to suspend the rules. It can not be amended in the way the gentleman suggests.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. It can be by unanimous consent. Mr. RAINEY. For this reason I shall object to such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I yield one and one-half minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Speaker, the fight for repeal is not led by the hierarchy of any church; it is led by the "lower archy" of all of the churches of America. We are endeavoring to lift up the pulpits to the level of the pews.

The legislative road to heaven has been infested with bandits. In order to abolish the bandits we have got to abolish the road. The taxpayer has paid the police to catch the bootlegger. The customer has paid the bootlegger to run away from the police. No wonder the bootlegger has considered himself the hero of a victory, while the policeman considers himself the victim of a double-cross. The customer is the taxpayer.

The budget of crime shows a surplus. The Budget of Government shows a deficit. Let us abolish the fortune of crime and reestablish the integrity of the finances of Government, the enemy of crime. Let us have one on the House. Prosit! [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am, indeed, gratified to have the chance of voting for this resolution. The resolution carries out the pledges and the promises not only of the Democratic convention but of the Republican convention, and has been approved by over 22,000,000 people and 42 States, notwithstanding that the Anti-Saloon League in Washington has been endeavoring to thwart the mandate of the 22,000,000 people by injecting sectionalism into the matter and to mislead willfully the membership of this House, as was done when the eighteenth amendment was first submitted.

All this resolution does is to submit the question to the people for approval or disapproval, and it protects the rights of every State. The charges by gentlemen that this will bring back the saloon is unjustifiable and unwarranted, and I hope will not mislead anyone. The threats by the forces of Bishop Cannon will be of no avail, as the membership of this House must recognize that this law-destroying, crime-breeding prohibition law should and must be repealed if law and order are to be restored. The sooner favorable action is taken the sooner law and order will be reestablished and the will of the people carried out.

In answer to the gentleman from Georgia, let me say that if the Members vote as they profess to vote at home, the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY].

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be clear, I ask that my statement, which I have sent to the desk, be read by the Clerk in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

A vote for to-day's repeal resolution is a vote of surrender on the main issue between the two great parties on the proposed repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

There was and is no issue as to the submission of a proposal to repeal or modify the eighteenth amendment. It is the right of the people to vote on any outstanding question. This is particularly true when it affects their own Constitution. On this both parties are agreed. The only question was and is what form the proposed modification or repeal amendment should take.

The Democratic Party indorsed naked repeal. The Republican Party opposed it. The Republican Party insisted that the repeal amendment contain some constitutional guaranty against the return of the saloon. The entire campaign, so far as it concerned the eighteenth amendment, was fought on this outstanding difference in the two major platforms.

The resolution which comes before the House to-day contains no such provision. It is an abandonment of any attempt at such action. The task of writing such a proposed constitutional guaranty is simple. No definition of a saloon is needed. A plain provision to take private profit out of the liquor business or to declare that the sale of intoxicating liquor for consumption on the premises where the sale is made be illegal is wholly sufficient.

In the absence of such a provision it seems to us that no Republican who took the 1932 party platform seriously should vote in favor of this resolution.

FRANK CROWTHER.
CARROLL L. BEEDY.
F. M. DAVENPORT.
ROBERT L. HOGG.
FRANK L. BOWMAN.
W. P. LAMBERTSON.
SCOTT LEAVITT.

JOHN G. COOPER.
WILLIAM E. EVANS.
ROBERT LUCE.
CLYDE KELLY.
CLIFFORD R. HOPE.
U. S. GUYER.
DAVID HOGG.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I am glad that I have lived to see this day. For 13 years the American people have looked forward to it. Let us do our part to make it a happy day by voting to sustain our party platform, restore confidence, bring back temperance, and reduce taxation. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the repeal resolution that was considered by the House on December 5 because I believed an effort would be made by those sponsoring the legislation to have the Federal Government call and supervise the conventions to be held in the several States for the purpose of ratifying or rejecting the proposal.

I am now of the opinion that those plans have been abandoned and that the States themselves will be permitted to refer the question of repeal to the people.

For these reasons, and in conformity with my campaign pledges, I am supporting the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. WEEKS].

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Speaker, this is an hour that may be fraught with gravest consequences to every home in America. It is on behalf of the American home that I rise in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution No. 211 which has for its ultimate purpose the invasion of that home by the liquor legions of the world. Not by my vote shall they enter lawfully. It has been bad enough to have such unlawful intrusion as we have witnessed in recent years, and I for one shall not sanction an effort to return to the lawful liquor desecration of the American home which was permitted prior to the passage of the eighteenth amendment.

If I appear pronounced in my convictions, let me assure you that they are founded on facts. For nearly 25 years I was connected with institutional work in Vermont. Thousands of cases came under my observation; many of them had my personal attention. It is a matter of record that in approximately 75 per cent of those cases, liquor was the underlying cause for the unfortunate circumstances in which the victim found himself. May the American home be uppermost in our minds when we cast our votes on this resolution.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK].

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker, to-day we are making history. For the first time we are giving to the American people an opportunity, through the convention method, to determine directly and authoritatively whether they wish to repeal an amendment to the Constitution. The repeal does not seek to change the fundamental law which was subscribed to by Washington, Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, and the other immortals of the Constitutional Convention. To them the eighteenth amendment would have been an unforgivable affront. The resolution now to be adopted proposes to repeal an amendment to the Constitution which, in a period of hysteria, was incorporated by a later generation in the fundamental law without any mandate of the American people.

It is a satisfaction that the repeal of this un-American amendment is not the proposal of any party but is now supported by a majority of the two historic political parties.

That this repeal of the eighteenth amendment will be ratified by a large majority of the States and by at least three-fourths of the American electorate is reasonably sure. If, unhappily, 13 States, numbering less than one-fifth of

the American people, should fail to ratify this amendment—and such failure is improbable—then the basic right of majority rule will not be defeated, for, if a large majority of the people on this solemn referendum favor such repeal, then their representatives in Congress will in that event enforce the will of the people by repealing all enforcing legislation. Happily, this will not be necessary. We propose the direct method of tearing up by the roots this upas tree of prohibition, whose blighting shadow has too long lain upon our people.

The American people, after a practical trial of the eighteenth amendment of over 10 years, are now convinced that it was a fatal error to write into the Constitution an amendment which was not only subversive of the fundamental principle of local self-government but also offended the greater and even more basic ideal of American individualism in vainly attempting, by governmental edict, to dictate to the citizen a narrow moral code of conduct in a matter of personal habit. This ill-fated experiment, which may have been "noble in motive," was doomed to failure from the beginning. It was alien to the individualistic spirit of America. The revolt of the American people against the eighteenth amendment is one of the most hopeful signs of the times, for it clearly indicates that the American citizen has not wholly lost his ancient love of individual liberty and his jealous hatred of government tyranny.

On February 7, 1930, I first had the privilege of expressing my views upon the eighteenth amendment in the Seventy-first Congress. I then tried to base the argument not upon the ponderables of the problem but upon the higher principle of the right of the individual, within reasonable limits, to order his own life and to be the judge of his own moral code. At that time those who shared my views were but a small minority in the House. This did not discourage me, for I had faith in the American people, who sometimes think slowly but, in the long run, surely. I believed then, and expressed my belief, that this great people were too wise not to acknowledge a demonstrated error, and I added:

Above all, they have not lost their love of individual liberty and their jealousy of governmental power, and if they do not, in their own good time, end this "witches' sabbath" of moral demagoguery, hypocrisy, and corruption, then I have much misjudged the character of the American people.

To-day we may be making history even in a larger sense than the mere repeal of the intolerable eighteenth amendment. For the last 25 years there has been a seemingly irresistible movement in this country to convert these United States into the united state. If history teaches anything, it is that a unitary state is not possible in a territory so vast as ours and with a people who are so numerous and heterogeneous. The unitary state, if it should finally triumph, would inevitably fall of its own weight, and of this the eighteenth amendment is a striking example.

To-day may mark the turn of the tide and the restoration of the Constitution of the fathers. If we shall return to the federated Republic which they founded, and respect the great and essential principle of local self-government, then many of the evils of the present hour will pass away, for the causes of our present discontent can be largely found in the impossible attempt to govern more than 100,000,000 people from Washington. "Back to the Constitution of the fathers" should be the rallying cry of all Americans. The broad path to complete centralization is the path to destruction. Let us take the straight and narrow path which returns to the earlier and nobler ideals of the Republic.

To-day is a new emancipation day for the American people, an emancipation not of one race but of all the people.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, this is not the question as to whether or not there shall be a return of the saloon, but the bigger and broader one as to whether or not we shall take prohibition out of the United States Constitution. The matter of the return of the saloon will then be for the States, and if the people of the respective States do not

want saloons there will be none. Prohibition is not the business of the Congress. The writers of the Constitution never intended it should be. It has been clearly demonstrated after 14 years of Federal prohibition that you can not legislate sobriety and temperance into a great free people. Drunkenness and disregard for the law, as a result of prohibition, are greater to-day than they have ever been.

Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of Congress when the resolution, out of which came the eighteenth amendment, was adopted the 17th of December, 1919. I voted against it and did all I possibly could to prevent its passage. Ever since that day I have looked forward to the time when we would repeal it. This vote to-day is the first step. In quick order I look for the 48 States to ratify this amendment to repeal the eighteenth amendment. This vote will itself have a good effect upon the country. The ratification will have a better one. This is not a Democratic or Republican victory. It is one of the people. Thousands of Republicans voted the Democratic ticket on November 8, last, believing that party more than the Republican Party would hasten the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. A majority of the Republican Members of this Congress will join to-day in voting with a majority of the Democratic Members in carrying out the mandate of the country, and that mandate is to take the prohibition issue of Congress, and prohibition itself, out of the Constitution and return it to the States, where it belongs and where it will be safely handled, as previously. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in my football days, in a hospital, on an operating table, with my leg and ankle being set where they had been broken in three places, there was still pounding in my ears the cry, "Hold that line! Hold that line! Hold that line!" And from America to-day here in this Chamber comes the earnest cry of anxious mothers and fathers of 48 States, "Hold that line!"

It is the open saloon that is bucking the line. Are we going to hold it? It is the hideous liquor traffic that is trying to break through. Are we going to hold it?

It takes brave men here to-day to hold the line. It takes men who are not afraid of wet newspaper criticism; who are not afraid of wet radio attacks; who can withstand barbed ridicule; who can not be destroyed by frame-ups; who do not quail under unjust misrepresentation; who do not lay down when obstacles arise; who can resist all pressure political and otherwise; who love their country better than they do public office and position; men who are willing to carry on, even when they receive threats of being "put on the spot," such as I received this morning; no other kind of men need try to-day to hold the line. Let me read you one of these threats I received in my mail this morning.

Mr. SIROVICH. Hold that line. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. You wets ought to be good enough sports not to interrupt a 2-minute speech on a most serious question. Saloons and liquor may break through this line to-day, but down the field this side of the goal stands an unerring fullback who never fails when downing a runner—the fathers and mothers of America—by whom saloons shall not pass. And let wet politicians now carrying the ball beware of the final tackle, for the fall will be hard. Here is the threat I received.

This letter says:

The people are tired of tactics in reference to prohibition. You believe the hypocritical preachers can keep you in office. Maybe they can, but they can not keep you alive. We are sending you an ultimatum. Vote right. Keep your nose out of prohibition or we are going to "bump you off."

It takes men who are not afraid of being "bumped off" to fight to hold the line. We will likely not hold it to-day, and I will likely be defeated for voting dry, and I may be "bumped off," but I will have been faithful to the trust my constituents have in me.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, this is the only method by which the question of prohibition can be settled. After all, the final decision under our Constitution is left to the people. I am in favor of the resolution, not because I believe that liquor is good but because I know that prohibition is bad.

A change in our liquor policy is necessary, not only because of the widespread violation of the law by the criminal element but the general and universal disregard of the law by well-meaning, law-abiding people.

I am in favor of the resolution not because I favor the licensed saloon but because I am opposed to the unlicensed speakeasy.

I am in favor of the resolution because it will be possible to tax liquor, not only because of depleted Federal and State treasuries but because of the dangerous enrichment of the racketeers and the criminal element.

Mr. Speaker, the lines of prohibition have broken. Twelve years' experimenting has demonstrated the impossibility of enforcement and the widespread use of liquor. We must place the liquor traffic under proper control. Mr. Speaker, we have been fighting for this resolution for the past 10 years. We are now too weary and too law-abiding to celebrate our victory. Congress will now be able to give its undivided attention to economic matters, less controversial but far more important. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to do away with the eighteenth amendment and its handmaiden of iniquity, the Volstead Act, with its highjackers, rum runners, snipe entrapments, "dirty business of wire tapping," shotgun murders, poison alcohol, use of children as spies, of coeds as stool pigeons, and of prostitutes as decoys, with its moral knavery and its political skullduggery. Let us flee from prohibition as one would from a foul dungeon, from a charnel house.

I am one of those who believe that a platform is something to stand upon, not something merely to get in on. The Democratic platform advocates this resolution. I am for it.

I will say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who wants "to hold the line," that his line is nothing but a "rope of sand." I say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] that his talk about the failure to include some provision against the saloon is a lot of idle chatter. He would not vote for the resolution if it did include such a provision. Each State must determine for itself the type of supervision it wishes over the distribution of liquor. Kansas shall not dictate to any State.

I say to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON] that there was a preponderating majority for this resolution during the recent election; 21,000,000 people spoke in thunderous tones. They want the eighteenth amendment consigned to limbo. The verdict of the people last November is a tribute to the returning common sense of our Democracy—the Democracy of Wilson, who vetoed the Volstead Act as not setting well on the stomach of the Nation.

Repeal of the eighteenth amendment, as has been argued, does not mean the return of liquor, since liquor has always been with us; its flow has never been dammed. Prohibition simply opened wider the sluices. New York City had 26,000 saloons before prohibition; it now has over 32,000 speak-easies. Under our very noses here in Washington during the 10 years after prohibition as compared with the 10 years before prohibition there have been five times as many arrests for drunkenness of persons under 21 years of age. Save the youth of the Nation by voting for this resolution.

We, wet veterans, have been patient. We have been battling for 10 years or more. Our struggle at first seemed hopeless, but we have carried on despite catcalls, howlings, and abuse heaped upon us. We kept on even despite threats of impeachment from the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. BLANTON]. I pay tribute to my wet colleagues, who, during 10 years, have had the wisdom, foresight, and courage to know the truth and to battle for it. To them, rather than to the belated wets, the half-hearted wets, the frightened wets, and the bandwagon wets, belongs the palm of victory.

Ratification is to be by conventions. There seems to be much pother about the convention procedure. There should be none. I may be wrong, but I incline to the belief that by reasonable interpretation the word "convention" as used in Article V of the Constitution precludes and repels the idea that the convention shall be called, elected, organized, or governed by congressional fiat. I incline to the belief that that must and shall be a State matter exclusively.

Without going into the question of the power of Congress in this regard, I would say as a matter of expediency, as a matter of policy, that even if Congress had the power to do all this, it should not exercise that power. In doing so Congress would irritate the States; it would stand in the rôle of interfering with the liberty of the States. The States would deem themselves affronted. Ratification might thereby be imperiled.

Each State shall set up its own procedure. There may be 48 different types of machinery. That is unfortunate, but can not be helped.

I would prefer to say that Congress compel each State to elect its delegates to a convention at large. But I do not dare advocate this for fear that I would again be imperiling ratification. The States would resent even this dictation from above. The election of delegates at large would prevent gerrymandering by the dregs.

It may be necessary, however, to blink the possibility of gerrymandering and refrain from exercising compulsion of any sort upon the States, in order to get the amendment ratified expeditiously.

The Supreme Court, in the case of *Lesser* against *Garnett*, held that the ratification by the States and the acceptance by the Secretary of State of the appropriate certificate is conclusive on questions of procedure in ratifying legislatures. There can be no different ruling on ratifying conventions. If the Secretary of State of the United States certifies to the certificates of ratification as submitted by the States, that should end the matter. Even the Supreme Court can not go behind the certificates submitted by the States certifying to the ratification. Therefore, no matter what method the State pursues as to the calling, electing, and organizing the convention, just as soon as the certificate of ratification by the State is submitted to Washington the method of conduct or procedure of delegates at the convention becomes a closed incident.

See interesting argument in this regard made by United States District Judge William Clark, page 12, Senate Document 181, Seventy-second Congress, second session.

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOCH].

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, the fair question about prohibition is not whether there are widespread violations, but what conditions would be to-day if we had no prohibition. If prohibition is to be repealed on the ground of its violation, the same logic would compel the repeal of most of our criminal statutes. Theft and robbery and murder are rampant in the country. Is that any reason for repealing the penal laws? Is there anyone who believes for a minute that in this day of world chaos, with its demoralizations, with its lowering of ethical standards everywhere, pay-day nights would be better, family life would be happier, highways would be safer, drinking among young people would be less, industrial life would be more secure, and political life would be cleaner if we had a legalized liquor traffic?

Let no one delude himself with the idea that the liquor traffic can be made decent simply by repealing the laws against it. It will be as it has always been, a destroyer of family life, a demoralizer of industrial and social life and a corrupter of political life.

Oh, this resolution may comply with the Democratic platform, but let no Republican here contend for a moment that it complies with the Republican platform. It plainly vio-

lates it. It tears from the Federal Government every vestige of power to prevent the return of the open saloon. Gentlemen may express a pious hope that the saloon will not return; but if this resolution is ratified, the saloon will return.

This is a surrender to the liquor forces which have always been lawless, and at a time when above all else we need to promote a spirit of law observance in the country. We boast of our liberty. But we can not long maintain liberty unless side by side with liberty we maintain respect for law, which alone makes liberty possible in the world. It is a vain delusion to imagine that surrender to the lawless liquor traffic will help to maintain it. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Article V of the Constitution provides:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress.

When we deem it necessary we shall propose amendments to this Constitution. I am unwilling to propose an amendment to which, under the circumstances, I am opposed. This resolution repeals the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution because I believe it is the first step toward the return of the saloon. It may be said that matter will be left to the States, but gentlemen sitting here that I can see have told me privately that the adoption by the States of this resolution means the return of the saloon. The Republican Party in its national platform declared against the return of the saloon, but this resolution permits its return.

If this proposal were anything new in the control of the liquor traffic we might be willing to try it, but we are going back to what we left after more than 100 years of trial. I am supporting prohibition, with all the difficulties we have had, because I think it is still the best method thus far advanced to control the liquor traffic. [Applause.] There is insistent demand for the consideration of economic questions to afford the people of the country relief. Instead of giving relief to the country to-day, what this resolution will do will be to take the first step to give relief to the liquor traffic.

My friends, let us vote down this resolution. As a member of the Judiciary Committee I listened to the arguments in support of prohibition, by teachers, religious leaders, economists, athletes, the representatives of home and school associations, parent-teachers' associations, social workers, and the representatives of many other groups from all over this country who enumerated the benefits of prohibition.

I am willing to cast my vote with those unselfish persons and with the thousands of others who to-day are praying that we shall not take a backward step upon this important question. These earnest, sincere, and unselfish persons desire a sober nation. I believe prohibition helped to bring this about. I am unwilling to return to a system of State control that we found unsatisfactory.

Let us not take the first step to bring back the liquor traffic which, in many instances, debauched our manhood, prostituted our womanhood, and pauperized our childhood. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the *Record* upon this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, to my mind this day is not only an historical day in this country and throughout the world, but to those people who are interested in a democratic form of government it points a new way and inaugurates a new era in the conduct of our democratic form of government, because for the first time the Congress of the United States is recognizing that we are made up, not of States, not of State legislatures, but that all Federal powers come from the people of the States, and we are sending this resolution back to conventions in the States for the nearest thing to a direct referendum that was ever had in this entire country. [Applause.]

I have always favored the convention system of ratifying constitutional amendments. I tried to have the convention system incorporated in the child-labor amendment and in the lame-duck amendment.

I am for repeal of the eighteenth amendment and always have been. I do not attempt any alibi that I am merely for the submission of the question to the people. I have some sympathy with the sentiment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARTER]. If his personal views coincide with those of his constituents, then I have no complaint against the right course he is following; but I frankly state, after this resolution is submitted, I am for the ratification of it and the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. I am going into my State, if anybody asks me, and openly advocate the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see this question taken out of our hands and placed in other hands, for one reason if for no other—it has furnished every possible form of alibi that can be conjured in a legislative mind. Some Members are for submission only, careful not to go so far as to say they are for repeal; others would be for it if it has a specific provision abolishing the saloon—whatever that is; others would be for it, if it were submitted to legislatures; others would be for it, if it were not brought up under suspension of the rules, and so forth. I am wondering if each and every one of these provisions were incorporated in the resolution would one vote be changed here to-day. In the last analysis the real test is whether you are against the eighteenth amendment or for its retention. As for me, I am against it.

As to the saloon alibi, let me point out to those who fall back on that as their reason for not voting for the resolution that the resolution permits every State to determine for itself whether it will have the saloon. During the last week the great Empire State of New York practically determined that there would be no saloons in the State of New York. When the State of New York leads the way upon such a question other States usually follow:

It is we who shall vote for this resolution who are "holding the line," let me say to my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. We are "holding the line" to-day in the cause of a true democratic form of government for these United States. So let us dispose of this question now and forever. Let us send the repeal amendment to the States where it belongs and from whose jurisdiction it never should have been taken. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 289, nays 121, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—289

Abernethy	Bacon	Boland	Campbell, Iowa
Aldrich	Baldrige	Bolton	Campbell, Pa.
Allgood	Bankhead	Boylan	Canfield
Almon	Barbour	Briggs	Cannon
Amie	Barton	Britten	Carden
Andresen	Beam	Brumm	Carley
Andrew, Mass.	Beck	Brunner	Carter, Calif.
Andrews, N. Y.	Black	Buchanan	Carter, Wyo.
Arentz	Bland	Buckbee	Cary
Arnold	Bloom	Bulwinkle	Castellow
Auf der Heide	Boehne	Burch	Cavichia
Bacharach	Bohn	Burdick	Celler
Bachmann	Boileau	Byrns	Chapman

Chase	Gavagan	Lewis	Romjue
Chavez	Gibson	Lichtenwalner	Rudd
Chindblom	Gifford	Lindsay	Sabath
Clague	Gilbert	Loneragan	Schafer
Clancy	Gillen	Loofbourov	Schneider
Clark, N. C.	Golder	Lozier	Schuetz
Cochran, Mo.	Goss	McCormack	Seger
Cole, Md.	Granfield	McDuffie	Selvig
Collier	Green	McLeod	Shannon
Condon	Gregory	McMillan	Shreve
Connery	Griffin	McReynolds	Sinclair
Connolly	Griswold	McSwain	Sirovich
Cooke	Hadley	Major	Smith, Va.
Corning	Haines	Maloney	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	Hancock, N. Y.	Mansfield	Snell
Coyle	Hancock, N. C.	Martin, Mass.	Somers, N. Y.
Cross	Harlan	Martin, Oreg.	Spence
Crosser	Hart	May	Stafford
Crowe	Hartley	Mead	Steagall
Crump	Hastings	Michener	Stewart
Cullen	Hess	Millard	Stokes
Curry	Hill, Ala.	Miller	Stull
Darrow	Hill, Wash.	Milligan	Sullivan, N. Y.
Davis, Pa.	Hollister	Mitchell	Sullivan, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Holmes	Monte	Summers, Tex.
Delaney	Hooper	Moore, Ky.	Sutphin
De Priest	Hopkins	Nelson, Mo.	Sweeney
DeRouen	Horr	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Dickinson	Howard	Niedringhaus	Thomason
Dickstein	Huddleston	Nolan	Tierney
Dies	Hull, William E.	Norton, N. J.	Tinkham
Dieterich	Igoe	O'Connor	Treadway
Disney	Jacobsen	Oliver, Ala.	Turpin
Doughton	James	Oliver, N. Y.	Underwood
Douglas, Ariz.	Jeffers	Overton	Vinson, Ga.
Douglass, Mass.	Johnson, Mo.	Owen	Vinson, Ky.
Doutrich	Johnson, S. Dak.	Palmisano	Warren
Drane	Johnson, Tex.	Parker, Ga.	Watson
Drewry	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Weaver
Dyer	Jones	Parks	Welch
Eagle	Kading	Parsons	West
Eaton, N. J.	Kahn	Peavey	White
Englebright	Keller	Perkins	Whitley
Erk	Kelly, Ill.	Person	Whittington
Estep	Kemp	Pettengill	Wigglesworth
Evans, Mont.	Kennedy, Md.	Pittenger	Williams, Mo.
Fernandez	Kennedy, N. Y.	Polk	Williams, Tex.
Fiesinger	Kerr	Pou	Wingo
Fish	Kleberg	Prall	Withrow
Fishburne	Kniffin	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Wolcott
Fitzpatrick	Kunz	Pratt, Ruth	Wolfenden
Flannagan	Kvale	Purnell	Wolverton
Flood	LaGuardia	Ragon	Wood, Ga.
Foss	Lambeth	Rainey	Woodruff
Freeman	Lamneck	Ramspeck	Woodrum
Fulbright	Lanham	Ransley	Wyant
Fuller	Lankford, Va.	Rayburn	Yon
Fulmer	Larrabee	Reilly	
Gambrell	Lea	Rogers, Mass.	
Gasque	Lehlbach	Rogers, N. H.	

NAYS—121

Adkins	Ellzey	Leavitt	Shallenberger
Allen	Eslick	Lovette	Shott
Ayres	Evans, Calif.	Luce	Simmons
Beedy	Finley	Ludlow	Snow
Biddle	Frear	McClintic, Okla.	Sparks
Blanton	French	McClintock, Ohio	Stalker
Bowman	Garber	McFadden	Strong, Kans.
Brand, Ohio	Gilchrist	McGugin	Strong, Pa.
Browning	Goldsborough	McKeown	Summers, Wash.
Burtness	Greenwood	Magrady	Swank
Busby	Guyer	Manlove	Swanson
Cable	Hall, Ill.	Mapes	Swick
Cartwright	Hall, N. Dak.	Mobley	Swing
Chipherfield	Hardy	Moore, Ohio	Taber
Christopherson	Haugen	Morehead	Tarver
Clarke, N. Y.	Hawley	Mouser	Taylor, Tenn.
Cochran, Pa.	Hoch	Murphy	Temple
Cole, Iowa	Hogg, Ind.	Nelson, Me.	Thatcher
Collins	Hogg, W. Va.	Norton, Nebr.	Thurston
Colton	Holaday	Partridge	Timberlake
Cooper, Ohio	Hope	Patman	Underhill
Cooper, Tenn.	Houston, Del.	Patterson	Wason
Cral	Jenkins	Ramseyer	Weeks
Crowther	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin	Williamson
Culkin	Kelly, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson
Davenport	Ketcham	Rich	Wood, Ind.
Dominick	Kinzer	Robinson	Wright
Dowell	Kopp	Sanders, N. Y.	Yates
Doxey	Kurtz	Sanders, Tex.	
Driver	Lambertson	Sandlin	
Eaton, Colo.	Lankford, Ga.	Seiberling	

NOT VOTING—16

Brand, Ga.	Hall, Miss.	Johnson, Ill.	Montague
Christgau	Hare	Knutson	Reid, Ill.
Free	Hornor	Larsen	Smith, Idaho
Glover	Hull, Morton D.	Maas	Stevenson

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The following pairs were announced.

On the vote:

Mr. Knutson and Mr. Hornor (for) with Mr. Christgau (against).
Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Montague (for) with Mr. Hare (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Brand of Georgia with Mr. Free.
Mr. Hall of Mississippi with Mr. Smith of Idaho.
Mr. Larsen with Mr. Reid of Illinois.

Mr. DRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am requested by my colleague, Mr. GLOVER, who is confined to his bed by illness, to announce that if he were present he would vote "no."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. MONTAGUE, is confined to his bed by sickness. He desires me to state that if he were present he would vote "aye."

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HONOR, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. SMITH of Idaho, is absent on account of illness. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. MAAS, is unavoidably and unexpectedly absent and can not secure a pair. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. SMITH, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. REID, are unavoidably absent, and if here they would vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REPEAL OF THE EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT—EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, to-day the House of Representatives, for the second time this session of Congress, is afforded the opportunity to vote on repealing the Eighteenth Amendment. On the first day of the present session we repealists in the House lacked only six votes of the two-thirds necessary, while to-day, with the additional impetus afforded by the Senate's favorable action last week, together with the added section of protection for dry States, every conceivable objection, in my opinion, is now squarely met. In accordance with our party pledges, we must pass Senate Joint Resolution No. 211 to-day, and by so doing, keep faith with the American people.

During the past few months we have witnessed the most remarkable and overwhelming demonstration of resolute determination ever staged by an awakened and thoroughly aroused population resolved and intent upon forcing abolishment of an unwise and deservedly unpopular law, one that has fostered and been the malevolent and prolific source of growing intemperance and crime, lost revenue and the consequent resort to other and unbearable forms of taxation, much of our distressing unemployment, and countless other economic and civic disorders.

I have direct reference to that unparalleled expression at the polls last November of popular sentiment against prohibition. The people of the Nation have given us a profound and impressive exhibition of their refusal to longer tolerate the imposition of this statute which has to date cost us \$11,000,000,000 or more in lost revenue and is adding to this stupendous sum at the rate of nearly a million dollars a day.

The sovereign will of the people on this vital problem has been manifested in clear, lucid, and unmistakable terms, impossible of misinterpretation. It is our sacred duty and obligation to heed and obey this outspoken mandate of the voters and, by voting to-day for passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 211, do our part in ridding the country at once of the most vexatious and troublesome measure ever inflicted upon a people renowned for their inherent and strict sense of personal right and liberty.

The overwhelming deluge of wet votes in the November elections—insistent and imperative in expressing the urgent and determined demand of the great majority of our patriotic, law-abiding, and sincere thinking citizens for immediate and outright repeal of the obnoxious eighteenth amendment—is the natural and inevitable culmination of many years' dissatisfaction and disgust engendered by the pronounced and ignoble failure of this gigantic attempt to regulate by legislative decree the personal habits and morals of our people.

Wide dissemination of statistics and facts relating to the enormous increase of criminal activity, the sinister racketeering of organized bootleggers and gangsters and the dis-

graceful corruption and bribery which have been notoriously rampant even among the ranks of the forces ostensibly devoted to prohibition enforcement, have awakened the people to the realization that paradoxically, prohibition has proved the greatest force imaginable for the promotion of the very evils the enactment of the eighteenth amendment was supposed to prevent and make impossible of recurrence.

Striking proof of the deep root this sentiment against prohibition has taken in the hearts and minds of the people is shown by the fact that seventeen States have either repealed or never had State prohibition laws; twenty-six that have retained their State laws to date are refusing to spend a cent for enforcement, while the five remaining States are making but a negligible effort to assist Federal enforcement officers.

Confronted by this decisive indication of our country's attitude and facing the most serious industrial and unemployment crisis the world has ever known, it would be criminal folly as well as the basest betrayal of the people to disregard their eloquent plea at the polls last November for outright and immediate repeal of prohibition.

Repeal of the eighteenth amendment is not only a patriotic duty of the highest order, but a fundamental economic necessity of extreme urgency. The wheels of industry are moving imperceptibly, business is stagnant, millions are unemployed in this great national calamity and world-wide catastrophe, and are dependent upon the fast-diminishing resources of welfare agencies for bare necessities of life.

Beginning with the producers of beverages, repeal will start a great chain of activity that will rejuvenate our entire business structure. Hundreds of thousands of unemployed will be permanently enlisted in the great fight being waged for business recovery. By no means, however, will employees of the various beverage concerns be the sole beneficiaries of this great progressive step. In the coal industry, thousands of miners will be put back to work immediately digging the approximately 3,000,000 tons of coal that was annually required for the brewing of beer alone. The automobile trucking industry and the stricken railroads will, of necessity, increase the number of their employees to haul the products that amounted to thirteen and one-half millions of tons yearly from just the brewers of beer, requiring constant operation of many hundreds of locomotives and the use of more than 200,000 freight cars annually.

These three major industries are splendidly representative of how hundreds of other commercial units of our economic system will be helped by the powerful stimulus repeal will bring to our harassed country. The farmers will find an immediate outlet for the vast quantities of surplus grain now flooding our markets and the demand will be instantly increased for various metals, machinery, bottles, bottle caps, corks, boxes, labels, printers' ink, barrels, lumber, miscellaneous hardware, and countless other articles too numerous to mention.

Repeal is an absolute and vital economic necessity, not only because of the work it will create for so many hundreds of thousands, and the tremendous impetus it will give to business in general throughout the entire country, but from the extremely important standpoint of a most prolific source of urgently needed revenue.

The tax on alcoholic beverages proved the only definite and dependable source of revenue of our Government for 50 years prior to the World War. From 1868 it did not vary more than 9 to 10 per cent from year to year, even in periods of business depression and financial panics. It steadily increased from \$39,000,000 in 1867 to \$284,000,000 in 1917. Before the World War and the enactment of the income tax our Government's income was made up almost entirely of customs revenue and taxes on liquor and tobacco. Depending as it does on foreign trade, the customs revenue varies widely and invariably declines in years of economic disturbance.

The customs receipts for the fiscal year ended last June were \$240,000,000 less than in 1928. The income tax is yielding less than half the 1928 total. The only source that is holding up with any degree of steadiness is the miscellaneous internal revenue, which is comprised chiefly of the tobacco

tax. Even these receipts have dropped somewhat from their normal yield.

By their whole-hearted indorsement of repeal the American people have shown their emphatic disapproval of a revenue-losing statute that is largely responsible for the tax condition that has caused the loss of thousands of homes and farms because of inability of their owners to pay taxes that have steadily mounted as incomes and national revenue have diminished. The taxation of beer alone will yield our impoverished Treasury a hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars or more yearly in a form of revenue that will inflict no burden whatsoever on the taxpayers and will make possible a great reduction in the present heavy burden of other taxes.

The vote last November 8 was virtually an ultimatum from the American people to release this golden stream of revenue which would help fill our empty Treasury and assist in bringing immediate relief to the Nation. To fail in this emergency to pass the repeal resolution to-day would be an un-American departure from the very principles of self-government upon which our great Nation was founded. The clear-cut issue confronting us to-day must be unflinchingly met in a true spirit of cooperation and nonpartisan unity of action. Jobs for hundreds of thousands, business for hundreds of industries, will spring into being upon the abolishment of prohibition, while every day we delay costs the Government a vast sum in indispensable and vitally needed revenue.

Let us show that in a great national crisis our American Government of Washington and Lincoln is still equal to any emergency. Let us show, by submitting this great question to the people for their final decision and judgment in State conventions, that ours is still the truly representative form of self-government that our forefathers bequeathed us. Let us triumph again, as we have many times in the past, over the relentless forces of the depression that are to-day besieging our country from within, and by removing this great obstacle to progress and ultimate recovery, show that we are still able and capable of directing our destiny as the greatest Nation on earth.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 211, which is now before us for a vote, reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Section 1 repeals the eighteenth amendment.

Section 2 attempts to protect dry States.

Section 3 provides State ratification by the convention method within seven years. It does not say a word against the return of the saloon!

Before the enactment of the prohibitory amendment, the saloon was a political center, in some respects a social center, and a very great power. The influence and political power of the American saloon were tremendous. Do you want it in action again? The saloon was the resort and center of almost everything that was undesirable and harmful. Experience shows the inability of the States acting alone to control the saloon.

This resolution is for the return of the saloon in America with no restriction guarding against its admitted evils.

I believe in the right of our people to decide under what laws they shall live and I desire to give to them every opportunity for an honest expression of such desire, but I can not vote to submit a resolution of this character which gives

them no opportunity to vote against the saloon, which I believe the people of my district do not wish to see returned. The resolution as introduced in the Senate gave Congress the power to prevent the return of the saloon. It was amended in the Senate by a vote of 33 to 32, with 31 not voting, striking out the section which gave Congress this power.

Four years ago Herbert Hoover, Republican candidate for President, vigorously opposed the return of the saloon, and Alfred E. Smith, Democratic candidate for President, in his acceptance speech said:

When I stated that the saloon is and ought to be a defunct institution in this country I meant it. I mean it to-day. I will never advocate or approve any law which directly or indirectly permits the return of the saloon.

President Hoover, in his letter of acceptance in 1932, said:

It is my belief that in order to remedy present evils a change is necessary by which we resummon a proper share of initiative and responsibility which the very essence of our Government demands shall rest upon the States and local authorities. That change must avoid the return of the saloon.

It is my conviction that the nature of this change, and one upon which all reasonable people can find common ground, is that each State shall be given the right to deal with the problem as it may determine, but subject to absolute guaranties in the Constitution of the United States to protect each State from interference and invasion by its neighbors, and that in no part of the United States shall there be a return of the saloon system, with its inevitable political and social corruption and its organized interference with other States.

Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt—now the President elect—on August 28, 1932, at Seagirt, said:

Thus the Democratic platform expressly and unequivocally opposes the return of the saloon and with equal emphasis it demands that there be Federal control of the liquor traffic to protect dry States.

The Republican national platform, 1932, says:

We do not favor a submission limited to the issue of retention or repeal, for the American Nation never in its history has gone backward and in this case the progress which has been thus far made must be preserved while the evils must be eliminated.

We therefore believe that the people should have an opportunity to pass upon a proposed amendment the provision of which, while retaining in the Federal Government power to preserve the gains already made in dealing with the evils inherent in the liquor traffic, shall allow States to deal with the problem as their citizens may determine, but subject always to the power of the Federal Government to protect those States where prohibition may exist and safeguard our citizens everywhere from the return of the saloon and attendant abuses.

The 1932 Democratic platform has a plank as follows:

We advocate the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. To effect such repeal we demand that the Congress immediately propose a constitutional amendment to truly representative conventions in the States called to act solely on that proposal. We urge the enactment of such measures by the several States as will actually promote temperance, effectively prevent the return of the saloon, and bring the liquor traffic into the open under complete supervision and control by the States.

Notice the clause therein—"effectively prevent the return of the saloon."

President Hoover, President-elect Roosevelt, and ex-Gov. Alfred E. Smith, as shown by these statements, all agree that the saloon should not be allowed to return. The National Government is the only power that can make certain this outcome. Many of those who have been fighting for repeal have declared their opposition to the return of the saloon. "The saloon, never" has been one of their frequent public utterances. This resolution is not in accordance with the Republican national platform. Notwithstanding all this, the section in the resolution as it was introduced, giving to the Federal Government the right to prevent the return of the saloon, has been taken out, and under our present parliamentary procedure we in the House are not permitted to attempt to restore it. I believe we should make the return of the saloon impossible. This resolution does not so do, but, rather, it provides:

Out goes the eighteenth amendment; in comes the saloon. I can not agree with or support this program.

Mr. GARBER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Joint Resolution 211 was submitted to the House to-day under suspension of the rules which limits time

for debate to 20 minutes on each side, prohibiting all amendments. It is to be regretted that a question of national interest, of such grave importance to the Nation, should be submitted under such a drastic rule as to prohibit amendments and discussion.

But the liquor interests of the country do not want discussion or publicity. Ever since this session convened they have been demanding immediate action. With great éclat and spectacular announcement a resubmission resolution was submitted to the House on the first day of this session. It was given priority over all other imperative measures awaiting action, and now, when the matter is again considered, the same arbitrary rule is invoked. I therefore am compelled to extend my remarks in the RECORD, that it may show my position upon this question.

The resolution reads:

That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States:

"SECTION 1. The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors in violation of the laws thereof is hereby prohibited.

"SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Under Article V of the Constitution, Congress is authorized to propose amendments to the Constitution by two-thirds vote of both Houses and when proposed and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress, then such amendment becomes a part of the Constitution. The same power of proposing amendments is reserved by the several States upon application of the State legislatures of two-thirds of the several States.

Under Article V cited, Congress may propose a resolution either to the legislatures of the several States or to State conventions. Its power is limited to that of proposing the resolution and to the designation of the agency as the State legislature or the convention, whichever it may select. The power of Congress thus ends with such proposals. It remains for the States, through their legislatures to determine, first, whether action shall be taken upon such proposal; and second, whether such action shall be one of approval or disapproval.

The resolution, having been passed by two-thirds majority of Congress, will now be submitted to the several States for their disposition.

The first section of the resolution provides for the naked repeal of the amendment. If the resolution is approved by three-fourths of the States, it will be the first instance of a repeal of an amendment to the Constitution in the history of our country.

Any thirteen States may defeat the proposal: First, by refusing to call a convention; and second, by refusing to approve the resolution should a convention be called.

Section 2 prohibits the transportation or importation of intoxicating liquors for delivery or use into any of the several States where the laws of the States prohibit such. This section, it is claimed, will protect the dry States. If the resolution is adopted and intoxicating liquors are again legalized, section 2 will prove unavailing in protecting the dry States. Bootlegging from the wet States into the dry States will be increased tenfold. In this modern period of transportation by automobiles, trucks, and planes, an ample supply will always be available, and the States will be helpless to enforce their dry laws and ultimately will be compelled to repeal them.

Section 3 requires ratification by conventions in the several States. This is the first requirement for submission to State conventions that has been enacted in our history. There is a general impression that the conventions referred

to will be similar to the old-time State political conventions and subject to all the political manipulations in the way of packing caucuses, trading votes, and so forth. But the conventions required will be an altogether different type of State agency. It will be a convention created by law, enacted by the State legislature, clothed with the same degree of solemnity and sanctity of law as State constitutional conventions. The State legislatures will fix the time and place of holding the conventions, the number of delegates, the apportionment of delegates, the qualifications of delegates, and the voters. It perhaps would utilize the election laws of the State as far as applicable in the selection of delegates and the adoption of the procedure in their selection.

At the present time there are 43 State legislatures in session. A desperate drive will be made to secure favorable action by at least 36 States calling State conventions before their legislatures adjourn. The wets are already organized to make this drive. They are amply supplied with money to pay the necessary expenses, and in doubtful States organization and money will determine the result of the conventions and may ultimately determine the issue of repeal.

It remains to be seen whether or not the people of the dry States will awaken in time to face the impending crisis now confronting them. Will they permit economic conditions to control their action? The strategy of the wets is to politicalize the depression to repeal the amendment. They claim the Government is in desperate straits financially, which is true; that unless additional revenues are provided for, its credit will be impaired and such impairment will affect financial conditions throughout the country; that the repeal of the amendment and the legalization of the manufacture and sale of beer and intoxicating liquors will give the Government \$150,000,000 additional revenue annually, and, second, such manufacture will furnish a market for farm grains and relieve the present distressed condition of the farmers. In this respect, it is hoped to make economic conditions control the moral conditions and determine the issue involved.

It is to be regretted that the House majority, through its leadership, should entertain even for a moment the submission of such a grave constitutional question affecting the morals of our people at such a time, and should lend a willing ear to the importunities, pleadings, and seductive influences of the bloated brewers and distillers of the country and give them prior and preferential consideration over the interests of the impoverished farmers and the millions of unemployed! It is to be regretted that such a proposal should even be entertained for a moment, let alone be considered and pushed through by caucus regulations to enactment, at a time when industries are closed; laboring men out of employment for want of work; when they are in bread lines for want of sufficient means to purchase food; at a time when the great industry of agriculture has collapsed; when the prices of farm products will not pay 50 per cent of the cost of their production; when farmers can not pay their taxes, interest, and mortgages, or purchase the bare necessities of life; when they are being sold out by the sheriff or compelled to resist such sales by physical force at the courthouses in order to save their homes; when business men are forced to the wall, into bankruptcy; when the banks are closed and are being closed every day and deposits tied up; at a time when there is no purchasing power in the hands of the producers and workers and the charitable institutions have exhausted their resources in feeding the hungry; that in the very midst of this cataclysm of economic conditions, without precedent, the demands of the brewing and liquor interests should be given right of way, prior, preferential, and favorable consideration at a time when the producers and the workers, out of employment through no fault of their own, are in need of every penny to buy milk and food for their children!

Why should the brewing and liquor interests be given such consideration? Have they been filling the lobbies in the committee rooms for charitable purposes, to relieve the hungry and unemployed and the homeless farmers ejected from their premises? They are interested in this legislation

solely for the profits they can make out of the business. At a time when the law-abiding people are not even thinking of profits, the liquor interests will not only continuously demand their profits but their tolls as well, in all directions, to control legislation. They will debauch the politics of the country and insist upon exercising the political influences to elect the sheriffs, the prosecuting attorneys, the members of the State legislatures, and of Congress. And yet we are told that a repeal of the law is necessary in order to secure law and order. If these criminal selfish interests will violate the law in one instance, what is to prevent them from doing so in the other?

This has been a sad day for the people of this country. Our standards have been lowered. The Christian citizenship of the country has been humiliated and the roll call just taken should have been accomplished by cathedral-bell solemnity in the presence of such a great tragedy.

We voted against the resolution because it affords no adequate protection to the dry States; it affords no adequate safeguards against the return of the open saloon; because bread-and-butter legislation for the millions of the unemployed now in the bread lines and the impoverished farmers now being evicted from their homes is of far greater importance than beer and liquor legislation for the profit of the brewers and distillers. The money to be spent in the consumption of beer and liquor is needed for bread and butter for the hungry and for homes for the homeless.

To thrust the consideration of this controversial question into the public mind already distracted with the grave questions of sustenance will contribute nothing to the stabilization of public opinion and the abiding peace and security of our country. Conditions already are menacing, are revolutionary, calling for the exercise of the highest degree of self-restraint, calm, considerate judgment, and the economic utilization of every penny to secure the necessities of life. The adoption of this resolution, without the enactment of necessary legislation by the States, will but encourage increased flagrant violations of law.

The submission of repeal, with adequate safeguards, under normal conditions might have been justified. The question could then have been determined upon its merits, uninfluenced by the prevailing economic conditions. The adoption of this amendment will be the beginning of the end and it will only be a question of time when the prohibitory laws of the dry States will be nullified and repealed.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, debate on the resolution repealing the eighteenth amendment being limited to one or two minute speeches, obviously too short a time to discuss the subject, I want to briefly present my views in the general leave given for extension of remarks.

Nearly simultaneously with the passage of the eighteenth amendment the people of the State of Maryland, whom I am happy to represent as one of their Congressmen, rose up in revolt and advocated the immediate repeal and restoration to the States of that power which had been taken from them by the eighteenth amendment. At that time I had just returned from overseas service during the World War and, not having been given an opportunity to participate in the vote which Maryland cast on the eighteenth amendment, I immediately aligned myself with those in opposition to that theory of governmental encroachment and activity, and from that date to this I have been active in my campaign promises and in my previous votes to bring about the enactment of legislation similar to that which passed the House to-day.

It is therefore my happy privilege to be able to not only vote my individual sentiment and views on the subject but to express what I have long since interpreted to be the will and desire of the people of Maryland, that this cancer in the Constitution of our country be removed without any trace of its malignancy remaining, and to restore as nearly as possible the Constitution to those fundamentals of government to which I believe our forefathers intended it to be limited.

It will interest the House to know briefly the history of the prohibition amendment and the change in attitude of Congress since 1917 to the present time toward that law.

On August 1, 1917, the Senate voted to submit the eighteenth amendment, and the vote was 65 for and 20 against, with 11 not voting.

On December 17 of the same year the House voted to submit the prohibition amendment with a vote of 287 for and 100 against, with 40 not voting. It will be noted that this vote numerically closely approaches the vote of the House to-day for repeal.

On January 16, 1919, Nebraska became the thirty-sixth State to ratify the amendment, and a few days later the adoption of the said amendment was proclaimed, and it became operative on January 16, 1920.

On July 22, 1919, the House passed the national prohibition act—the Volstead Act—with a vote of 287 for and 100 against.

On September 4, 1919, the Senate passed the same legislation without a record vote. On October 27, 1919, President Wilson vetoed the Volstead Act, and on the same day the House overrode President Wilson's veto by a vote of 175 to 55, with 198 Members not voting; and on the following day the Senate also overrode the veto.

The legality of the Volstead Act was immediately challenged, and on June 7, 1920, its validity was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1921 antibeer legislation was passed by Congress, but not until 1928 was there any record vote reflecting the attitude of Congress for the prohibition amendment. On February 15 of that year the House voted on the Linthicum amendment to prohibit enforcement appropriation and forbidding the poisoning of industrial alcohol. I was one of the 61 voting for that amendment, but there were 283 votes against it, and the House therefore refused even this sensible interference with the existing law, and seemingly were unwilling to submit to any change whatsoever.

In 1929 a semblance of a test appeared in the vote of the House on the \$24,000,000 enforcement appropriation with a record vote of 244 for and 141 against. The following month, February, 1929, the Senate and the House voted for the Jones five and ten law, the Senate vote being 64 for and 18 against, while the House vote was 284 for and 90 against. In each of the foregoing instances it was my privilege to vote in the negative.

It can be seen from the foregoing period of 12 years, aside from additional and more drastic dry laws, no vote of the House or Senate looking to repeal or modification had become a matter of record. I returned to Congress in 1921, succeeding as I did my dry predecessor, who represented the Second Congressional District of Maryland, or, I might say, misrepresented it, so far as the attitude of his people upon this important question was concerned, and not until March 1, 1932, were we able to bring a wet-and-dry issue to the floor of the House. One hundred and forty-five signatures were obtained on that day to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the Beck-Linthicum resolution for repeal. On March 14 the House voted, 169 for and 228 against this discharge rule, but from that day on those of us who made up the 169 realized that the end of the eighteenth amendment was not far distant. We forced another vote at a later date on the beer bill, which was also defeated 169 to 228.

All of the agitation throughout the country and the change of sentiment as reflected in the votes of Congress brought for the first time an expression in the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Conventions, advocating in general terms what the resolution of to-day puts into legal form and effect. When the present short session of Congress convened in December I was in sympathy with the decision of Speaker Garner to force a vote upon the repeal resolution and while that vote of 272 for and 141 against was short of six votes only to gain it the required two-thirds, and, therefore, pass it, I believe this overwhelming

sentiment furnished the necessary encouragement to the Senate for the action of that body which followed on February 16, 1933, when the resolution received the necessary two-thirds, the vote being 63 for and 23 against, and also furnished the necessary encouragement for the caucus action of the two major parties in the House and the culmination of all that effort in the success of it's being passed when 289 Members voted for and 121 Members against the resolution.

I have cited the foregoing brief recapitulation of record votes to show first how determined Congress was 13 years ago to do an unwise thing and yet how responsive the same lawmaking body of our Government has been to the popular demand of our people.

Almost immediately after the passage of the eighteenth amendment the lawless element of our country took advantage of the disrespect and disregard for this sumptuary law and steadily and to an alarming extent bootleggers, racketeers, demagogues, and criminals of every conceivable character flooded our courts, debased the sanctity of our laws, invaded territories in our country theretofore protected by local option and in general presented a most disgusting and humiliating condition for a country enjoying the traditions that ours does to tolerate. It was perfectly inevitable that the best thinking people of the country would demand a change and it is not surprising to find the great Democratic Party being the first political organization in its national platform taking a definite, open, easily understandable position in favor of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the submission of that great question to the people of the States of the Union.

The Democratic platform of 1932, under which President-elect Roosevelt ran for the Presidency, said:

We advocate the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. To effect such repeal we demand that the Congress immediately propose a constitutional amendment to truly representative conventions in the States called to act solely on that proposal. We urge the enactment of such measures by the several States as will actually promote temperance, effectively prevent the return of the saloon, and bring the liquor traffic into the open under complete supervision and control by the States.

Twenty-one million of our people rallied to the support of the Democratic candidate, and I am quite sure this unprecedented vote was due very largely to the desire and the feeling of certainty they had that if the Democratic Party was given control of the Government, one of the first actions of the administration would be the redemption of this pledge.

It is a source of real satisfaction, therefore, to find the present Congress, controlled absolutely by the Democratic Party in the House and almost having a majority in the Senate, not waiting for the Seventy-third Congress to convene but as loyal Democrats, sensing the sentiment of the people of this country and the platform upon which many of them had been reelected, to vote immediately in the present Congress this important change in our organic law.

In these troublesome times it will go far to restore confidence in Congress and in our people.

The foregoing has not alone presented the reasons for this change in sentiment. The overburdened tax-paying people of our country know that prohibition has not been, and can not be, enforced, and yet we have contributed to date approximately \$6,000,000,000, or about one-third of the total national debt, in attempting to enforce this law. Our United States courts, which should be devoting their time to serious and important litigation, are clogged with cases of picayune character because of this law.

Taxes collected on liquor in 1919 would have paid one-half of the huge deficit of this country in 1931.

Without reflecting in any way upon the ability of the legislators of my own State and the other States, the set-up of convention machinery, as the resolution calls for, and I am sure this thought will be of use and value to those serving in the legislatures of our States at the present time. Take Maryland, for instance; in the election of November 8, 1932, Governor Roosevelt received an overwhelming majority, as well as Senator Tydings and the six Democratic Members of the House. Maryland has a total population of 1,600,000,

of which number 470,000 reside in my congressional district. Of the majority received by President-elect Roosevelt in Maryland, approximately one-third was given by the congressional district I represent, and yet the Eastern Shore of Maryland is said to be dry, if we look at the vote of my able and distinguished colleague who represents that district. If that be true, then any convention assembled in Maryland should reflect the popular will of the State as a whole, and not on the basis of representation therein, such as our legislature is made up of at the present time. I mean by this that while the existing representation of the counties and cities might be advisable for certain purposes, the problem we are now dealing with—that is, to change the Constitution of our Government—is a broad, state-wide question, and one in which popular sentiment should prevail and control. I hope, therefore, that not only my own great State, a pioneer in advocating this victory which has come to the country to-day, so far as Congress is concerned, will set up at a very early date, through enactment by the present legislature now in session, a model bill for the calling of a convention to pass on this resolution, and one that will appeal to other States of the Union because of the assurance it will give to the great masses of our people where the popular sentiment and feeling of the people will prevail against any idiotic and asinine schedule of representation where county lines or city lines might, as a result of existing law, otherwise dictate.

I feel that the vote I have cast on this resolution to-day interprets the desire of the people of the great district I represent, and I am happy to report in this way it has been my privilege to voice their sentiments and their feelings against the eighteenth amendment in the vote I have cast for its repeal. I believe I am promoting temperance in changing present conditions, because I have confidence in my own State when the eighteenth amendment is repealed to see to it in the expression it gives to the prerogative of the State in permitting the sale, manufacture, and use of intoxicating liquors to protect those parts of Maryland which want to be dry, and to control those parts which want to be wet in a way that will restore the respect and confidence of our people in the existing law.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, I vote "aye," because I believe the American people have the right to decide this question for themselves.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, in the brief one and two minute speeches permitted under the exceedingly limited time allowed for debate, the outstanding arguments of the opponents of this resolution were predicated upon four grounds:

First. That the eighteenth amendment is a good thing.

Second. That its repeal would bring back the saloon.

Third. That Members believing in prohibition would stultify themselves if they voted to permit the people of the sovereign States to express their views on the subject.

Fourth. That the passage of this resolution would pave the way for Federal legislation dictating to the sovereign States the times, places, and procedures of holding the State conventions.

It would be vain to rehash the arguments of the last 13 years. Suffice it to say that the people have spoken. The verdict of the last election, in which both the great parties stood for submission of the subject to conventions to be held in the separate States, indicates quite clearly that the voters of the country now realize that the eighteenth amendment has not been the success that was anticipated.

"A COSTLY AND UNPROFITABLE EXPERIMENT"

Mingled, no doubt, with that conclusion it is evident that the people of this country have come to realize that prohibition by force is now about proven to have been a very costly and unprofitable experiment.

It has deprived the United States Treasury of excise revenues of over half a billion dollars a year for 13 years—aggregating six and one-half billion dollars—besides entailing interminable expenditures for enforcement—increased courts, penitentiaries, judges, clerks, and enforcement officers. Added to that, and this is no negligible

factor, has come the expense of making arrests for prohibition enforcement of from fifty to one hundred thousand persons a year, with all of the charges for maintenance and costs incidental thereto.

SOCIAL AND MORAL DEGRADATION

With this picture of the mere material costs of prohibition, in addition to the social and moral degradation ensuing in its wake, it is not surprising that the American people have begun to suspect that the abortive attempt at prohibition enforcement is largely responsible for the present deficit in the Treasury and the mountainous taxes which are now piled up on the backs of our suffering taxpayers.

THE PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE ON IT

Be that as it may, the proposition that confronts us to-day in voting on this resolution is whether or not the American people should have the opportunity to express their convictions with finality on the subject by the lawful constitutional method provided by the fifth article of the Constitution, instead of being compelled to resort to newspaper and magazine straw votes, to find out what ought to be done about it.

That is all there is to this resolution. A vote for it is neither a vote for the eighteenth amendment nor a vote against it.

The text of the resolution does not touch on the merits of the question, nor bind any Member as to his ultimate individual action. If he votes for this resolution, he may go back to his constituency and fight as hard as he likes against repeal. No one can challenge him. No honest dry at home can blame him for his action here; no honest wet here can blame him for his action there.

But, on the other hand, a vote against this resolution is a virtual annulment of the fifth article of the Constitution itself, which grants the right of submission of any proposal when there is an obvious popular demand for it.

A vote against this resolution is an arbitrary denial of justice evincing a desire, at any cost, to keep the people bound forever in the shackles of a law against which there has rolled up an almost universal wave of condemnation.

Those who take this stand of refusing to put their convictions to the test of popular approval confess their own weakness and their fear of defeat.

THE RETURN OF THE SALOON

Fears about the return of the saloon are utterly unfounded. No State can have saloons within its confines unless it wants them. If it does want them, that is the business and sole concern of the people of that State. Even at that, impartial opinion is now unanimous that the worst saloon is better than the best speakeasy, with its attendant train of bootleggers, thieves, cutthroats, and racketeers.

Take the case of Maine, which to-day was referred to as a model State in paving the way for total abstinence by force. Does anyone believe that there is such a thing as real total abstinence in Maine? If he does, his innocence is amusing. Prohibition has only been maintained—or the semblance of it maintained—in Maine by the most degrading connivance between the prohibition forces and the police and the owners of the thousands of speakeasies. The officials simply ignore the existence of the speakeasy for 364 days in the year. Then, as collection day comes round, the places are raided and the owners fined \$1,000 or thereabouts, which is the equivalent of what would be an annual license fee in a self-respecting and decent state of affairs. Having paid his fine, the owner goes back to his blind tiger and resumes business as usual. No, my friends, do not talk about Maine as an example—except as one that ought not to be emulated or perpetuated.

AS TO THE CONVENTIONS

The sole remaining alibi for voting against the pending resolution is that its passage will open the way for congressional interference with the times, places, and procedures of holding the conventions. There is no merit in that excuse. The resolution is carefully worded to avoid that very pitfall. Its very brevity is its safeguard and recommendation. It

leaves the initiative to the States to act upon it of their own volition.

The Constitution itself was ratified by conventions in the individual States, without either molestation or dictation by the Continental Congress and without the suggestion of financial aid or pressure of any kind. The States to-day can be safely relied upon to follow this precedent.

The language of the resolution is perfect in its simplicity and gives the largest measure of latitude to the States in holding the conventions as to times, places, and procedures.

There will be no justification for Congress to meddle with their sovereign freedom. There is no need to. The wet States will be only too anxious, if anything, to start the conventions moving in order to win. In like manner, the dry States will not be less diligent in striving hard not to lose. It is a fair issue which should be left to the people of the country to decide, as is their sole right and province.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, nothing will do more at this time to restore prosperity and to renew confidence in the American Congress than the passage of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment resolution to-day.

Congress has never suffered a more violent barrage of abuse and criticism in its history than during recent months. Representative government has been under attack and suspicion as never before. Nothing Congress could do in counterattack could be more effective than to pass promptly this repeal resolution.

Whether rightfully or not, the majority of the American people have a firm and ever-growing conviction that the repeal of the eighteenth amendment will speed the return of prosperity more quickly than anything else.

First. The people look forward to increased employment in the brewery business and all its accessories and ramifications of business. They anticipate the employment of hundreds of thousands of additional workmen.

Second. They anticipate the release of millions of dollars of capital in the tremendous purchasing power of raw materials and equipment and tremendous investment in transportation.

Third. They anticipate the lessening of crime and the destruction of gangs of gunmen and racketeers. This means less public expense in maintaining law-enforcing agencies, such as patrolmen, detectives, courts, jails, and so forth.

Fourth. Tremendous deficits have grown up in every branch of Government and additional revenue is absolutely necessary. The people are clamoring for the hundreds of millions of dollars revenue to be gained from the taxation of beer, wine, liquor, and so forth.

These are only a few of the reasons why the people are convinced that the eighteenth amendment is an overwhelming failure. They gave their mandate for its repeal by an overwhelming vote in last November's elections. Our Government is a failure if it does not register the people's wishes in this matter.

I have every confidence that the States will speed ratification after to-day's vote. When the Senate passed the repeal resolution, I promptly telegraphed wet leaders in Michigan, and Michigan is now exerting itself to win the honor of being the first State in the Union to ratify the repeal.

This is one of the happiest days of my life, for I have devoted many years to prevent the adoption of the eighteenth amendment, and I have also fought aggressively and persistently for many years to secure the repeal of this dreadful law.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend remarks upon the motion made in the House Monday, February 20, to suspend the rules and to pass Senate Joint Resolution 211, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, I submit some of the considerations which have induced me to vote for this resolution.

This proposed amendment to the Constitution is, in fact, a proposal to repeal the eighteenth amendment, but also to give a constitutional guarantee that the transportation or importation into any State of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws of such State, shall be prohibited

forever. If 36 States should act in favor of ratifying this proposed amendment, then, undoubtedly, each and every State in the Union could be just as dry as its own laws make it and as its own courts and juries make it.

The Democratic platform adopted at Chicago in 1932, on which Roosevelt was elected President and on which I was elected to Congress on November 8, 1932, binds the Democratic Party to submit to the States a proposal for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. I am a Democrat by tradition, by inheritance, by association, and by conviction. I have always been a Democrat, and I expect to remain one as long as I live. Of course, the Democratic Party in the past has made mistakes and probably will make mistakes in the future. But however numerous and serious its mistakes may be, they have been, and are, and will be, less numerous and less serious than the mistakes of the Republican Party. There is no other major party before the American public, and the warnings of history do not encourage us to contemplate the organization of a new party. Hence, my resolution to remain a Democrat is well grounded in reason and conviction, and I expect to remain a Democrat as long as there is breath in my body.

Before the campaign for the nomination by the Democratic primary in South Carolina was closed, the National Democratic Convention had met in Chicago, and had adopted the platform to which I refer, and had nominated Roosevelt for President, and he had appeared before the convention and had expressed his personal resolution to stand upon that platform, and to seek to carry out its policies, if he should be elected. In like manner, during my campaign for renomination by the Democrats of the fourth congressional district, I declared that I stood upon that platform from beginning to end. Being a Democrat, I do not consider myself at liberty to pick and choose those parts of the platform that I approve and will support. If I can reject one plank in the platform, and still be a Democrat, I could reject two such planks, and finally could reject 99 per cent of the principles and policies declared for in that platform, and still be a Democrat. Such a conclusion is logically preposterous. A man is not obliged to be a Democrat, and if he is a Democrat, he is not obliged to be a candidate for office upon a Democratic platform, but if he chooses to be a Democratic candidate, then I submit that good faith compels him to accept the platform as a solemn obligation to the people. If, after the platform was formulated, I could not conscientiously support its principles, then it would have been my duty to myself and to my political friends to have declined to be a candidate.

I have been surprised, therefore, that some of my personal friends have urged that I am not bound by the Democratic platform to support the resolution to submit to the States a proposal to repeal the eighteenth amendment. If I am not bound by that specific pledge of the Democratic platform, then I am not bound by any other pledge in that platform. Those who advocate repudiation of a part of a platform should remember that such a principle would lead to the repudiation of the entire platform. Furthermore, unless there be such a thing as political honor and political integrity, evidenced by the support of a party platform, then party government and popular government are doomed to failure. Unless the people have some assurance that their representatives will keep their pledges made during a campaign, then they will lose confidence in representative government; and when confidence fails, the government itself will fail.

Furthermore, those who advocate the repudiation of a part of the platform, by the same token advocate party perfidy and political treason. If a candidate is not bound by the party platform, written with deliberation and adopted by the representatives of the party in convention assembled, then a candidate would not be bound and should not be bound by his public speeches and private conversations during a campaign. If a candidate for office should during a campaign by his speeches promise the people that he would vote for the revision of the tariff, and if, after election, he

should refuse to vote as he told the people he would, then the people would have a right to denounce him as a traitor and to spurn him from their confidence and party councils. Even more so should the people repudiate a Representative who refuses to abide by the solemn platform pledges upon which he was elected to office.

MY SPECIFIC PLEDGE AS DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE

But as for myself, I signed a pledge, required by the party rules of South Carolina, binding me specifically, if elected to Congress, to support the policies and principles of the Democratic Party, and to act in cooperation with my colleagues in Congress in furtherance of same. The history of this pledge and its fair and reasonable interpretation show that reference is made to the principles and policies of the National Democratic Party, and those principles and policies are to be found expressed in the latest National Democratic platform. It would be idle and absurd to seek to bind the Representatives from South Carolina to cooperate with their Democratic colleagues from other States in promoting the principles set out in the Democratic platform of the State of South Carolina, or of the State of Georgia, or of the State of Tennessee, or of the State of Texas. Undoubtedly, the purpose and intention of that pledge is to bind the Democratic Members of Congress from South Carolina to support the principles and policies of the National Democratic Party as expressed in the National Democratic platform.

TO AMEND IS TRUE AMERICANISM

Feeling that I am honor bound by the foregoing considerations to submit to the States the question of repealing the eighteenth amendment, I have voted so to do. This proposal is not radical, nor un-American. In fact, it is the very essence of Americanism. It is the taproot of democratic institutions. It is the heart and soul of the republican form of government. The people are the masters in America. The people have adopted the Constitution of the United States in conventions assembled, and the people have already ratified 20 amendments to that Constitution. If the Constitution should never be changed then the eighteenth amendment could never have been adopted. Members of Congress at that time voted to submit to the States a proposal which became known as the eighteenth amendment. If I had been in Congress at the time I would have voted to give the people of the States the chance to say whether or not they desired to confer on Congress this police power of regulating the manufacture, sale, and distribution of alcoholic beverages.

The people of the States have been living under the law passed in pursuance of the eighteenth amendment, and dissatisfaction therewith has been widespread enough to cause both major political parties to declare in favor of a change. These two political parties represent, as shown by the vote, over 95 per cent of the people of America. The popular vote cast in favor of the prohibition candidate and his platform was almost negligible. The difference between the Democratic and the Republican platforms on this question is well-nigh infinitesimal. The proposal which has now been submitted to the States by the action of the House of Representatives to-day, contains the essence of the platforms of both parties on that subject. It is true that the Democratic platform declared that there should be out and out repeal, and the Republican platform declared that there should be repeal, but reserved to the Federal Government the power to prevent the return of the saloons in any part of the Nation.

The proposal voted on to-day gives to every State absolute power to control the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic and intoxicating beverages. It will be up to the people of every State to say whether or not they will permit any intoxicating beverages to be sold or transported or stored in each such State, and if they, by their State laws, prohibit such manufacture, sale, and transportation within the State, then, such State laws will be supreme on that question, and whiskies can not be shipped into, or transported into such State; and, if laws prohibiting such

importation and transportation of intoxicating beverages are violated by common carriers, or by private individuals, then State courts, and State juries must try, and convict, and punish all such violations.

EACH STATE'S WILL SUPREME IN MAKING AND ENFORCING LAWS

In other words, if 36 States should ratify this proposed amendment, then the fight will be transferred from Congress to the legislatures in each State to say what the law of that State shall be. If the law of South Carolina remains as it now is, then there is no danger whatsoever that liquor will be sold or transported into, or manufactured in, South Carolina. If South Carolina will look after her own problems along this line, and I know she did it well before the adoption of the eighteenth amendment, and if Georgia will do the same, and if North Carolina will do the same, and if the other States of the Union do the same, then there will be much less intoxicating beverages made and sold and transported than is the case now. A law of this kind can be best supported by the people of the State enacting that law. So long as it was possible to throw the expense and responsibility upon the shoulders of the Federal Government, then the State governments let their own laws remain in a state of quasi abeyance.

FEDERAL CALL AND CONTROL OF CONVENTIONS REVOLUTIONARY AND DANGEROUS

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to record, as I did in December, my solemn conviction that any attempt by the Congress of the United States to enact a law for the calling of conventions in all the States, to meet at the same time, and to be subject to the same Federal regulations concerning membership, and all the other qualifications for voting for delegates, would be unconstitutional, un-American, undemocratic, and unwise. My conviction is perfectly clear that the Congress has no power, either express or implied, to call a single convention of the sovereign people of a single State, to pass upon any question, whether it be the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution or anything else. To grant such a power would be the most dangerous step in the destruction of our dual system of government that the human mind could conceive. To grant the power proposed by the Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer, and some others, would make it possible for a party in power and in control of the Federal Government, to work its own will in the uprooting of, and destruction of, those things that are most fundamental to American life and American institutions.

There has been no more radical and revolutionary and dangerous proposal made since the days of reconstruction following the War between the States. If such a proposal ever finds expression in the form of a bill introduced in Congress, then I pledge myself to exert every ounce of my strength, both physical and mental, to defeating that proposal in the most summary and decisive manner. The very suggestion itself is repugnant to the principles of any person grounded in the doctrine of States' rights. The justification for any such proposal is rested upon a few fugitive and unimportant dicta of the Supreme Court. Being familiar with the history of that court and having studied its doctrines and decisions for 40 years, I feel that if a majority of both Houses of Congress could ever be induced to vote for any such proposal, and if any American citizen, sitting in the chair of President, could ever be prevailed upon to sign his approval to any such bill, then an appeal to the courts to test the constitutionality of such a proposed law would meet with the prompt and unanimous declaration of all the courts of the land that the same is unconstitutional, null and void.

If ever the power and right of the courts to declare an act of Congress to be unconstitutional, and therefore null and void, is justified, then the case now under consideration would be the most thoroughly justified of all cases that have ever been considered. The reason is that it is the solemn duty of the Supreme Court to preserve not only our Constitution but to preserve our constitutional system. It is the duty of the Supreme Court not only to declare and protect the rights of the Federal Government but to declare

and protect the rights of the States. If the rights of the States are invaded, and if by reason of such invasion the rights of the States are ultimately destroyed, by the same act the Federal Government would be destroyed. It would cease to be a confederation, and would become a consolidated and single sovereign government.

The very argument advanced by the Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer in support of his plan whereby he suggests that if State legislatures are hostile to the contemplated amendment to the Constitution, then even if they call a State convention they may so fix the qualifications of those who are to vote and of those who are to be elected delegates, and the number of delegates, and the districts from which delegates may be selected, and the time and place of meeting, and all the other details of such a convention, as to completely defeat and overthrow the effort to amend the Constitution.

I admit that it is true. To grant the existence of a power is to grant the possibility of abusing that power. The power to do right in a sovereign way involves the power to do wrong. The power in a legislature to enact good laws of necessity involves the power to enact bad laws. By the same argument, but with multiplied danger to our dual system of government, to admit the power of the Federal Government to call conventions in States and to fix the qualifications for those who vote and to fix the qualifications of delegates and to prescribe the territory to be represented and to fix the time and the places of election and the time and places for the meeting of the convention would be to admit the existence of a power in the Federal Government which might be exercised at any time, whereby amendments might be railroaded through and adopted that would destroy our whole plan of government in America. To concentrate such a power into the hands of the single Federal Government would give to that Government the power of destroying America herself. But to distribute that power among the people of 48 States is in the interest of safety and wisdom. While a few States might abuse their power, it is not likely that 36 States would at the same time abuse their power to the extent of ratifying an amendment to the Constitution which would pervert and destroy the beauty and symmetry of the system.

For these considerations I hope that no effort will be made to enact any such law, but if such an effort is made, I pledge all that I can do to its swift and overwhelming defeat.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, when it provided that the proposed twenty-first amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be ratified by conventions to be held in the several States, thereby expressed its desire that all of our citizens should have an equal opportunity to be heard individually on this all-absorbing question.

Since the passage of the resolution there has been much comment on the manner in which this might be accomplished. Many contend that the Congress of the United States has authority to and should set up the machinery for calling these conventions. The consensus of opinion, however, seems to be that the framers of our Constitution, in recognition of the sovereignty of the States, intended that the calling of the convention should be purely a State function. I am of this belief, for the reason that to hold otherwise would be contrary to the spirit of our Federal Constitution and might result in a usurpation by the Congress of certain vested rights retained by the States at the time the Constitution was originally adopted.

There has been much discussion of the manner in which these conventions might be called by the several States. Having in mind the intent of Congress that all of our citizens should have an equal opportunity to voice their desires, and having in mind also the numerous suggestions which have been made in each of the States as to the form the legislation should take, I have evolved a plan embodying a method of procedure which I believe will carry out the intent of Congress, and which is also expeditious and easily comprehended. It is suggestive only, and may be so modified as

to coincide with the election machinery of the several States. The plan in substance contemplates the nomination and election of a small body of delegates and carries out the principle of the so-called electoral college. Legislation may be enacted by the several State legislatures providing for the following:

First. The purpose of the convention.

Second. The time and place of holding the convention; the time and manner of holding primary and general elections, which may be in conformity with existing law.

Third. That the convention shall consist of a number of delegates equal to the number of congressional districts within the State. Where there are too few congressional districts to make this advisable, a stated number of delegates may be elected at large, or a delegate may be elected from each State senatorial or representative district, or more than one from each such congressional, senatorial, or representative district if it is thought advisable to increase the number of delegates.

Fourth. That one delegate be nominated on each side of the question from each congressional district, but who shall be elected at large, as hereinafter provided.

Fifth. That each person desiring to be nominated in each district shall file with the secretary of state, previous to circulating nominating petitions, an affidavit substantially as follows:

I, ———, being duly sworn, depose and say that I reside at ———; that I am a citizen of the United States, of the age of 21 years and upwards, and am a qualified elector of the county of ——— in said State. That I am a candidate for nomination to the office of delegate to a convention to convene on ———, in the city of ———, State of ———, for the purpose of considering the ratification of the proposed twenty-first amendment to the Constitution of the United States; that if elected to said office I will vote in said convention for (against) the ratification of said amendment.

Sixth. That each person so desiring to be nominated shall file with the secretary of state, after the filing of such affidavit and before a specified date, a nominating petition signed by a number of electors to be designated, in substantially the following form:

We, the undersigned, qualified electors of the township (city) of ———, county of ———, State of ———, hereby nominate ——— of ———, county of ———, State of ———, as a candidate for the office of delegate to a convention to be held at the city of ———, in said State, on ———, for the purpose of considering the ratification of the proposed twenty-first article of the Constitution of the United States; that it has been represented to us that ——— has heretofore filed with the secretary of state an affidavit declaring that if nominated and elected to said office he will vote for (against) the ratification of said amendment.

These nominating petitions may be filed with the secretary of state before a specified date preliminary to the printing of the name of such candidate on the primary ballot. In lieu of a number of signatures of electors, provision may be made for the filing of a fee. It may be also provided that where only one person files on either side of the question from such district, he shall be certified by the secretary of state as the nominee, and in this event no primary election will be necessary.

Seventh. That the primary ballot be arranged in columns; one column to be headed "For ratification," and the other column to be headed "Against ratification." In their respective columns should be listed the names of those who have qualified by filing the affidavit and petition; the names of those having declared that they will vote for ratification will be listed in the column under such heading; likewise, the names of those who have by their affidavit and petitions declared their intention to vote against ratification will be listed in that column. Squares should appear opposite the names of such candidates in which the elector may declare his preference. In casting his ballot the elector may vote for one candidate in each column, and the person receiving the highest number of votes on each side of the question

shall be certified as the nominee on that side of the question by the secretary of state.

Eighth. The election ballot may be prepared in like form, except that these persons nominated in the manner provided shall become one of a group of as many delegates as there are congressional districts. The elector when casting his ballot in the general election will vote for all of those persons designated as nominees in the column wherein his desires are expressed. For example: In States having 17 congressional districts, 17 individuals will be nominated on each side of the question as delegates to the convention, and their names will all appear on the ballot under respective headings, the same as the names of presidential electors now appear on ballots cast for the election of the President and Vice President. A person desiring to vote for ratification will vote for all of those who have been nominated under the column headed "For Ratification." Likewise, a person desiring to vote against ratification will vote for the 17 names under the heading "Against Ratification." That group of delegates so elected will receive certificates of election by the secretary of state and will organize and conduct the convention.

To avoid any question of personalities, the legislature may also provide that the form of the ballot to be submitted to the voter at the general election shall be in substantially the following form:

Shall the proposed twenty-first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is as follows, be ratified:

The proposed amendment may be set forth in full on the ballot, with a provision for the elector to vote either "yes" or "no."

In this event the legislation must provide that an affirmative vote shall for all intents and purposes be deemed and construed as a vote for that group of nominees who have been nominated to vote for ratification; a negative vote will for all intents and purposes be deemed and construed as a vote for that group of nominees who have been nominated to vote against ratification. This plan is thought advisable because under it the voter will be casting his vote directly on the question, with all personalities eliminated.

The question will be raised as to whether this is constitutional. Let me observe that in the election of presidential electors in the election last November, many States had previously provided by law that the names of the candidates for President and Vice President be written on the ballot in lieu of the names of presidential electors, and that a vote for these candidates would, for all intents and purposes, be deemed and construed as a vote for the group of presidential electors named by the respective parties in their conventions or primaries.

Ninth. The legislation may also provide the manner of conducting the convention; the election of temporary and permanent officers; the manner of casting and recording the votes in the convention; and the manner in which the proceedings shall be recorded and certified to the secretary of state. The secretary of state then certifies the result of the convention in the manner now provided by law.

This plan, it will be seen, does not contemplate the election of delegates by districts. It provides that every qualified elector of any State shall be given an equal opportunity with every other elector to express himself on the question of ratification. It prevents gerrymandering and the possibility that minorities might control the conventions. It is to be hoped that these suggestions will be found helpful. The principle involved will at least meet with response from those who are conscientious in their belief that the people should be given an opportunity to directly solve the problem of prohibition, without interference by groups or minorities.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, in voting for Senate Joint Resolution 211, submitting to the States the question of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, I adhered strictly to the position which I consistently have taken on this important subject over a period of years.

During the campaign last fall a representative of the Women's Organization for National Prohibition Reform asked me to state my views on the question of repeal. I quote the following self-explanatory extracts from my reply to her:

During our interview this afternoon I also read you verbatim a report of remarks I made in Springfield under date of May 23, 1931, and which were printed in the Springfield Republican and Union the following day. I quote from these remarks as follows:

"As before stated, I voted to submit the question of adoption of the eighteenth amendment to the legislatures of the States because of the then preponderant sentiment of the people for such submission.

"In order to be consistent, if a similar preponderant sentiment is shown to exist for resubmission, I should deem it my duty to vote in Congress for such resubmission."

If reelected to Congress and the question comes before the House in the usual method of procedure, I shall vote for resubmission, preferably to State conventions called in accordance with constitutional provision.

As further evidence of my adherence to the position which I have publicly announced on various occasions, I call attention to the fact that in the first session of the Seventy-second Congress I voted "yea" on the following measures:

H. J. Res. 208. Proposed amendment to the Constitution to amend the eighteenth amendment. On motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10017. To permit the manufacture and sale of beer, etc., of not more than 2.75 per cent of alcohol by weight, and placing a tax thereon. On motion to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means.

During the second session of the Seventy-second Congress I voted "yea" on the following measures:

H. J. Res. 480. Proposing an amendment to the Constitution to repeal the eighteenth amendment.

H. R. 13742. To provide revenue by the taxation of certain non-intoxicating liquors, and for other purposes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress can only propose amendments to the Constitution. It is for the people to ratify or reject. The resolution just adopted submits the question of the retention or rejection of the eighteenth amendment to the people. It provides protection for dry territory. It provides for ratification by conventions. The Federal ban on saloons was dropped out by the Senate after full argument because it was found difficult of application. Prevention of the return of the saloon and its attendant evils is left to the States.

My platform for nomination and election has the approval, before announcement, of both friends and enemies of the eighteenth amendment as a fair and just proposition. It called for a submission of the question as follows:

The issue in respect to prohibition is: Shall the people have an opportunity to determine it by their votes?

I favor a prompt submission by the Congress of the question of the repeal or retention of the eighteenth amendment in such a way as to provide, as nearly as possible, a direct vote on that issue. It should be decided openly and decisively at the polls by the American people themselves. I prefer a straight direct vote, but that way is not now open. A properly framed convention plan is the best substitute.

The bootlegger and racketeers must be driven out of the country. In the event the people repeal the eighteenth amendment they should prevent the return of the saloon and its attendant evils.

The provisions of the resolution fairly meet the platform on which I was elected. I would not be entitled to the confidence of my constituents, whether wet or dry, if I went back on it.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am supported by an overwhelming majority of the electorate of Connecticut in voting to repeal the eighteenth amendment to our Constitution.

Connecticut in its longheadedness, its conservativeness, its allegiance to constitutional traditions—and Connecticut, as you know, created the first Constitution in America—was one of the very few States—two, I believe—to refuse to vote to enact the eighteenth amendment.

Ten years' prohibition experiment has brought disgrace to America, ruination of our youth, disregard for law and order, hard times, and a dangerous increase of criminal

class and criminal wealth, so great and so dangerous as to menace the security and good name of our communities and our Government.

We welcome the chance to eliminate this eighteenth amendment conceived in misrepresentation as a supposed patriotic temporary war measure, by well-meaning but misguided citizens of our land.

Were I in doubt as to my personal convictions, and I am not, I would but turn to my party platform of the 1932 Chicago Democratic Convention which overwhelmingly elected President-elect Roosevelt and read:

We advocate the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. To effect such repeal we demand that the Congress immediately propose a constitutional amendment to truly representative conventions in the States called to act solely on that proposal."

I answer that demand by not only voting for such plank, but state I would consider it a breach of party faith and good citizenship to vote otherwise.

I have little patience with the die-hard drys who talk of the peril of the saloon. The saloon under past State control, though perhaps undesirable, out of date, and likely not to be restored, was infinitely better than the present-day speak-easy. Prohibition technically abolished the saloon. It actually created the speak-easy. In my section of the United States, I feel safe in saying for every saloon existing before prohibition days there are one or two more speak-easies.

These establishments are unregulated in their thousands by any other form of government than the rule of the beer baron and the bribe or blindness of Government officials. They live through the utter inability of our Government to regulate, stop, or control same.

We have found we can not regulate by law the morals or tastes of our citizens. That is for the home, the church, the uplift, social, and religious organizations of the country, not the statute law of this or any land.

Any law that flouts our inherent constitutional rights and traditions, our country's ideals of freedom—the homely, crude standards of the mass of our people—can not be enforced. Any unenforceable law, though an apparently good law for the few, is the kind of law which creates lawlessness, crime, and anarchy; the sooner repealed the sooner order and peace are restored. I venture an opinion that this repeal, if carried through the House by a two-thirds vote, will be supported by nearly all the 48 States in conventions assembled; respect for law will be restored, business progress will be aided, and taxation reduced. It will be at least one step—and maybe one big step—in turning back the depression and bringing a more satisfied America again to work.

I feel that one of the strongest elements in this measure is the feature which gives to each State the right to regulate its own liquor traffic free from wet States' interference or so-called regulation by the present Government's discredited prohibition service. It will aid and protect the so-called dry States in permitting them to exclude, if their citizens so wish, all liquor traffic in their domains.

My State of Connecticut has no more speak-easies or illegal liquor traffic than any other State. We are one of the most law-abiding States in the Union. We desire real regulated State liquor traffic, a regulation of such a character as will come exclusively from the excise laws of Connecticut, and give opportunity to return to a higher standard of law and order than prevails in this country to-day.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why I can not conscientiously vote to repeal the eighteenth amendment and bring back the legalized barroom. I shall not now, at all, attempt to discuss all of them; I shall only mention one or two and make just a few observations. Feeling as I do about this matter, I would be a traitor to my conscience and to those who believe as I do if I voted for the return of the saloon—I would be acting a deliberate falsehood and not entitled to the respect or confidence of either those who honestly believe in the open barroom or those who are just as conscientious in their opposition to it.

The mighty drive is on for the return of the open barroom in every State, in every county, at every cross road, in every city and town, in every block, on every corner, open every day in the week every hour of the day, without the payment of license or tax—if possible—without restriction, and with the determination of this mighty political and financial force to dominate all local, State, and Federal Governments and to crush out the life of every one that opposes it.

No one who remembers the activities of the liquor interest before the adoption of the eighteenth amendment can question this now being the ultimate objective of the big whisky interest; neither can anyone who closely studies the fight now being waged in the country by this interest at all honestly doubt this now being their main objective. Long before the adoption of the eighteenth amendment, the late Senator Thomas E. Watson of Georgia, in speaking of the liquor traffic said:

It is a warrior whom no victory can satisfy, no ruin satiate. It pauses at no rubicon to consider, pitches no tents at nightfall, goes into no quarters for winter. It conquers amid the burning plains of the South, where the phalanx of Alexander halted in mutiny. It conquers amid the snowdrifts of the North, where the grand army of Napoleon found its winding sheet. Its monuments are in every burial ground. Its badges of triumph are the weeds which mourners wear. Its song of victory is the wail that was heard in Ramah: "Rachel crying for her children and weeping because they are not."

It never buries the hatchet; its temple of Janus never closes its doors. No dove of peace ever carries its message; in its hand is never the olive branch. It sends no flag of truce and receives none, its wounded are left where they fall, and its dead bury their dead. Every citadel that it storms it devastates, and in every charge that it makes its cry is "No quarter."

Those who fall before its onset die deaths of shame, and they go down to dishonored graves to which love can bring no willing tribute of flowers and over which pride can rear no enduring monument. To its prisoners it grants no exchange, holds them to no ransom, but clutches them fast in a captivity that is worse than death and ends only at the grave.

Mr. Speaker, there is no middle ground; the fight is on, to the finish, for the return of the saloon. This resolution could have been drawn so as to have prevented the return of the saloon. It was deliberately drawn so as to permit the return of the saloon. It was taken up in the House, deliberately and purposely, in such a way as to prevent any amendment to prohibit the return of the saloon. The purpose to bring back the saloon is the motive back of this entire move. Let no one be deceived and let no one mislead others as to this matter. Those who are fighting for the return of the saloon are opposed to the Representatives of the people here in Congress having the chance to vote on this matter. They are opposed to the people's representatives in the various States having the chance to vote on the various phases of this question and they are deliberately preventing the people of the Nation from having a referendum on this question to determine whether the people desire the retention of the eighteenth amendment, or the return of the barroom, or some form of sale of intoxicants under governmental control other than by the open saloon.

No chance has or will be given to either Members of Congress or members of the State legislatures or the people of our country to say whether or not they want the eighteenth amendment repealed and either a Federal or State dispensary system in its stead. Nowhere at any time—either in Congress or out—will those who are opposed to the eighteenth amendment but do not want the return of the saloon have a chance to vote their convictions. This great conservative, middle-ground, reasonable group of our very best citizens, to whom both the Democrats and Republicans sought to appeal last national campaign, are to be denied the right of a vote expressing their own views on this most vital issue. Only those are to be allowed a vote in this contest of life and death who are extreme and do not want the repeal at all or who are equally as extreme and want the return of the saloon with all its hideous consequences and nothing else.

We all have extreme views at some time on some matter and we are all wrong sometimes, and those who occupy the middle ground are right ninety-nine times out of a hundred

and yet these—probably much the larger half of our voters—are the citizens of our country who are to be deliberately deprived of the right to participate in this much-heralded and much-boasted referendum.

If the wet forces in Congress want all the people to have a referendum on this question, let them submit to the States another resolution providing for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, but preventing the return of the saloon, and also one providing for State and/or Federal dispensaries and so on, in this way submitting to the people for their consideration the various proposals in connection with this important matter.

This will not be done. Those who favor the return of the saloon dare not give the people the right to pass on this question. But it is urged that the Democrats are bound by platform pledge to vote for the repeal resolution. Let us see about this. I do not find any plank specifically pledging repeal and the return of the saloon. Were not the people led to believe that there would be urged and sponsored repeal coupled with an absolute prohibition against the return of the saloon? Are not the wet forces of both parties now absolutely repudiating the campaign pledges and pronouncements of both parties when it is sought by them to put over this mighty drive to disfranchise all those with average views on this subject and to bring back the saloon without a fair referendum?

The extreme wet forces want just whatever is necessary to help them secure the return of the saloon. They favor the kind of a referendum that helps them; they are opposed to any referendum that might get a result other than the saloon. They always have, and now oppose all party pledges, all law, and all parts of the Constitution interfering with their drive for the return of the saloon; they favor only that which helps them in this fight. The wets are not in position to criticize those of us who do not favor this resolution. They just as well admit that they are fighting for the return of the saloon and accord to those of us who are opposed to the saloon the same honesty of purpose which they claim for themselves.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for Senate Joint Resolution 211 to submit the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the various States of the Union. On the first day of this session I voted against such a measure for the reason I thought it was not timely nor proper to put the liquor question against the remedies to overcome this depression; when the people were demanding bread they should not, at the first opportunity, be given liquor. Then, too, the proposed measure did not comply with the Democratic platform in that it did not provide for the protection of States which remained dry. During my service in Congress I have voted against all repeal and modification acts and voted for all appropriations seeking the enforcement of the prohibition laws.

There is not a doubt but what the repeal of the eighteenth amendment will be submitted to the States of the Union, if not at this session, then by the next Congress, which will be most overwhelmingly for repeal. Under such circumstances the dries should fight for the most favorable measures with proper restrictions, such as this measure contains. If this measure were left to the next Congress it is possible that legislation might be passed which would give the Federal Government the right to hold the election, the supervision thereof, and also fail to contain a provision to protect the dry States.

I am considered the standard bearer and leader of democracy in my district, and whatever honor I have as a Congressman I owe to the Democratic Party. I feel it my duty to either go with my party or get out of it. The Democratic platform adopted at the 1932 Chicago convention provided:

We advocate the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. To effect such repeal we demand that the Congress immediately propose a constitutional amendment to truly representative conventions in the States called to act solely on that proposal.

It also provided and demanded of Congress a modification of the Volstead Act. As a delegate to that convention I was opposed to and voted against this provision of the platform. It is a cardinal principle of democracy that the majority

should rule, and should I place my personal opinion and views above this platform at a time when the question was made an issue, I would be attempting to be bigger than my party. I can not conclude that the overwhelming victory of last November was other than a mandate to support the party platform. It would be hypocrisy to use the platform only for the purpose of getting into office. Both the Democratic and Republican platforms demand the submission of this question by Congress to State conventions.

The laws of our Government are based upon party procedure; no party can successfully function and accomplish good for the people that is not organized and united. A caucus of the Democratic Congressmen has been called and voted to instruct its membership to vote for the submission. In my opinion, a Representative can not expect to legislate only for his district; no community can live unto itself. It is necessary that we should vote for the welfare of the entire Nation where it is not ruinous, harmful, or destructive to our own districts. I am convinced that the constituency of my district does not expect me to be out of step with my party nor to fail to function and carry out its demands.

The submission of the eighteenth amendment simply means the various States of the Union shall have the right to vote upon the question of repeal. This resolution means that elections will be held in every voting precinct; and if a majority are opposed to the repeal, then Arkansas will remain dry; unless three-fourths of the States of the Union approve this resolution, the eighteenth amendment will not be repealed. In a debate in Congress made by the leader of the prohibition forces asking for the adoption of the eighteenth amendment he said:

The Member of either branch of the American Congress who denies the power of amendment to the States, especially an amendment which vast numbers of the people desire the States to consider, violates the basic principles both of the Constitution and of the popular Government, repudiates the fundamental rights of the States, and overturns the two most sacred privileges the people possess, the privileges of referendum and of petition.

The liquor question always has been and will always continue to be of grave importance to the welfare of our people. Under present conditions a vote for submission is not a wet vote nor in any way compromising with the liquor interests.

Regardless of the result of the vote on this repeal, I am thoroughly convinced that saloons are outlawed and will never again be permitted in this Nation.

In a recently published signed statement, Dr. A. C. Millar, minister, a leader of the Anti-Saloon League in Arkansas and the editor of the Arkansas Methodist, states:

While I am for the eighteenth amendment, I have for several years contended that under present conditions it might be best to have a referendum on the question, and I even went so far in meetings of the executive committee of the National Anti-Saloon League as to offer a resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution under which the people might vote by States on the question.

MR. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the high esteem I have for multitudes of good friends who disagree with me on my prohibition votes, and which is not affected or diminished in the least by our honest differences of opinion, prompts me to make this statement explaining why I can not go along with the majority of the House and the majority of the body at the other end of the Capitol in support of this pending resolution for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

Goaded and harassed by appalling economic conditions our people have drifted far from the moorings of safety on the liquor question. Among all of our ills piled mountain high the pending resolution is, I fear, the culminating tragedy born out of the distress of the times.

The saddest part of it all is that when the storm subsides and economic peace again settles over the land and when, with the cessation of the turmoil we might reasonably expect brighter days, contentment, and happiness ahead, we shall awaken to find that we have provided no constructive program of liquor control to take the place of prohibition but have fastened upon ourselves the old saloon and all the old evils of the liquor traffic and that after a hundred years of noble effort to solve the liquor problem we are back just

where we started. If prohibition is to be repealed, we should at least submit something constructive to take its place and in the resolution of resubmission should protect the major gains it has brought about, chief among which is the elimination of the saloon.

As a newspaper writer of 40 years' experience in various large cities in close contact with life's activities, I can give first-hand evidence in regard to the damage that was done to society by the saloon. As a young police reporter, zealous in the pursuit of news, I spent a great deal of time in saloons, and in gambling places and brothels, dark and sinister establishments of which the saloon was a feeder, while I garnered human-interest stories about the saloon's tragic toll. And such opportunities to delve into the realm of human interest as we reporters of those times had, with sorrowful tragedies unfolding around us that would defy the descriptive powers of a Dickens or a Hugo!

I can see to-day, as if it were but yesterday, the saloon of the olden time, with the gambling gentry in checkered vests and reverberating haberdashery who lingered and plied their calling thereabout, and set their traps to catch their human toll, and the scarlet women with big hats and gorgeous plumes who flitted in and out and seemed always to be in the offing. I can see unsophisticated girls fresh from their mothers' apron strings caught in the net of the wine rooms and started on the downward path to perdition. It would be a hard-hearted person indeed who could see them drawn into the vortex without being touched with infinite compassion. As I look backward in the moving panorama I can see a great many men bearing the image of their Maker made into wrecks in the saloons and then delivered as human derelicts at the gates of hell.

No one need tell me that the saloon was not a social canker. It is not guesswork as far as I am concerned. I know it was by the indubitable evidence of my own eyes and ears. I know by having seen men of good intentions converted by it into beasts who went home and beat their children. I know by the girls it started on the primrose path to ruin. I know by the scores and hundreds of fine, intellectual newspaper associates of mine whom it sent to premature graves. I know by the murders, suicides, divorces, and wrecked homes I can trace to it. I know by the gamblers who swarmed around it as moths attracted to a flame and whose intake from their victims was a part of the devil's grist. I have always been against the saloon and I am against it now.

I am sorry to see so many good men on both sides of this chamber and outside of the chamber supporting it—men for whose character and motives I have as high esteem as I have for my own but who, I believe, are misled by the emotions of the hour. I think they are making a tragic mistake for which many of them will be truly sorry in the years to come.

I would forfeit their respect if I were to vote for something which I believe to be wrong. The only way I can justify the confidence of those who sent me here is always to vote according to my conception of right and as my conscience dictates, and that I always intend faithfully to do.

I can recall at this moment hundreds of splendid friends on the opposite side of the liquor question for whom I have a real affection. To them I owe this explanation of the vote I shall cast to-day. I think they regard me as being like the Irishman at the drilling match who is out of step with all of the rest of the regiment. I am with them in bonds of friendship and their sharp letters and telegrams or criticism are poignantly painful to me, but the good Lord has given me only one head to think with and one heart to love with. I can not think that any roseate embellishment of the saloon will make it righteous or that it would ever be right for me to sanction it or support its reappearance in the life of America, and I love my fellow beings too much ever to want to put this infliction upon them. There has never been any change in my attitude toward the saloon and there never will be. I want it always to remain an outlaw. As between the saloon on one hand and humanity on the other hand I take my stand for humanity. When I first

ran for Congress in 1928, I so expressed myself and in each one of my two campaigns since then I have made my position plain and unequivocal. When the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment interrogated me in the recent campaign, I stated in writing my position to be:

In no event and under no circumstances by any vote or influence of mine will I be a party to the return of the saloon and the old-time liquor evils in America.

America at present is a very sick Nation. The malady we suffer is both economic and spiritual in its nature. We are now feeling the full rebound of the awful toll of war. A power higher than mortal ken or vision is teaching us the costliness of war and the danger that comes from lowering our spiritual standards. I do not know how long, O God, we shall have to remain in this crucible, but of one thing I am certain and that is that the return of the saloon and the old liquor domination would not cure our malady but would aggravate the ills that now afflict us.

The resolution (S. J. Res. 211) before us to-day opens the way for the return of the saloon and the old liquor evils under the protection of our Government. I am against it. In the name of the millions of inarticulate men, women, and children in the homes and the ordinary walks of life who are seriously thinking this afternoon about what all of this means, though their voices can not be heard in this historic chamber, I oppose this resolution, which is wide open and without a single ban or check against the saloon. I am going to play square with them and with the boys and girls of to-morrow, and with the boys and girls of all the to-morrows that are to come, by voting against the return under legal sanction of what I believe to be a damnably wicked institution.

CLARENCE R. KILLION

Mr. HILL of Alabama submitted a conference report on S. 2148, for the relief of Clarence R. Killion.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. AYRES, from the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 14724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. FRENCH reserved all points of order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if it is the intention to take up anything beside the Consent Calendar to-day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that there is a long Consent Calendar. To-day is the last day of this session that you will get an opportunity to call the calendar. It seems to the Chair that the entire day, if necessary, should be devoted to the consideration of this calendar, and he indulges the hope that the membership will cooperate with the Speaker in facilitating the consideration until the calendar is completed to-day?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York. In a conversation with the majority leader a few moments ago he assented to a suggestion that he ask for another night for the purpose of completing the Consent Calendar, if it becomes necessary.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, that does not interfere with the program for this afternoon, does it?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. What is the order for the 22d of February?

The SPEAKER. If the House determines to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, it can do what it desires to do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker appoint the Clerk or one of the Members to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first consult the majority leader and others before he recognizes anyone to ask unanimous consent for that purpose. The Clerk will call the Consent Calendar.

MODOC NATIONAL FOREST

The first bill on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 188) to extend the provisions of the forest exchange act, approved March 20, 1922, to certain lands adjacent to the Modoc National Forest, in the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADDING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE MODOC NATIONAL FOREST

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 189) to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, in the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The department properly recommends striking out certain provisions in this bill which are not necessary and would not be affected in the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the reason why we should extend the national forest to a tract of land comprising 640 acres already entered upon and privately held? Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that objection for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the objection.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The author of this bill has been temporarily called from the Chamber, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT]. I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over until he returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKHEAD). The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over for the present. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RETURN TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS OF UNEMPLOYED FILIPINOS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the resolution (H. J. Res. 577), to provide for the return to the Philippine Islands of unemployed Filipinos resident in the continental United States, to authorize appropriations to accomplish that result, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

OTOE AND MISSOURIA TRIBES OF INDIANS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4578) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjudicate the rights of the Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians to compensation on a basis of guardian and ward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. A companion House bill was considered on the Consent Calendar and was objected to about a month or so ago. I have given further consideration to this bill, even to the extent of examining some of the United States Supreme Court decisions which confirm the opinion I held that this bill should not pass. Therefore, I object.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interfere and ask permission to speak, but I do want to say that if the gentleman has definitely made up his mind that he is going to object I shall not detain the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, since a companion House bill to this was under consideration I have examined Supreme Court decisions and they confirm my position taken at that time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then the gentleman is going to object?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am. Mr. Speaker, I object.

LIMIT OF COST OF ONE AIRCRAFT CARRIER

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14243) to authorize an increase in the limit of cost of one aircraft carrier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object. This would add another \$2,000,000.

SUPERINTENDENT OF HAWAII NATIONAL PARK

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4374) to empower the superintendent of the Hawaii National Park to perform the functions now performed by the United States commissioner for the said national park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, give the Delegate from Hawaii a chance to explain his bill.

Mr. BLANTON. But Congress is constantly appointing too many assistants, both in Hawaii and the United States. Let the principals do some work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman objects to the present consideration of the bill.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

AGRICULTURAL ENTRY OF LANDS WITHDRAWN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 13745, to provide for agricultural entry of lands withdrawn, classified, or reported as containing any of the minerals subject to disposition under the general leasing law or acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not want to reserve the objection to this bill. I object, Mr. Speaker.

LEASE CONCESSIONS OF RESERVOIR SITES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5070, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease concessions on reservoir sites and other lands in connection with Indian irrigation projects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, there is insufficient information in this report to satisfy me. What kind of concessions are these that are to be given?

Mr. LEAVITT. The lands have to do with homes and pastures, and other uses to which the area may be put. Of course, the concessions would also be business concessions.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. That is what I am getting at. They are leases to business people to put up some sort of a business on this Government property?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Now, where do the Indians fit in on this?

Mr. LEAVITT. I offered an amendment myself when this was before the committee. Of course, the gentleman knows it is not my bill. In the reprint the gentleman will notice the first line reads: "The Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Indians involved."

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, yes. The gentleman anticipated my next question. What good is consultation if we do not give the last say to the Indians? After all, it was their money that built these projects.

Mr. LEAVITT. Does the gentleman wish to change that to "consent" rather than "consultation"?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Well, I would like to have it "consent," and I would like to know if the Indians really want these concessions there?

Mr. LEAVITT. Oh, yes; I am sure they do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am fearful, if we make the concession conditional upon the consent of the Indians, it will be difficult of operation. These are short-term leases, just merely for the surface rights. We virtually destroy the administration of the bill if we require the consent of the Indian tribes.

Mr. LEAVITT. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely correct on that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am in sympathy with the position taken by the gentleman from New York in trying to safe-

guard the rights of the Indians, and we provide here that they shall be consulted.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman knows these are not short-term concessions. The gentleman also knows that a few days ago we had an illustration of those concessions, where they put up a building, and after they found the concession was not profitable, they wanted the Government to pay for the building.

Mr. STAFFORD. I regret very much the gentleman has brought that matter back to my attention, for the reason, as stated on that occasion, that in my early years I was in the concession business, and perhaps I know more about the concession business than the gentleman from New York did when he was out in Arizona. I believe the concessionaires should have had the privilege to remove their improvements, as they are generally constructed with that understanding.

Mr. LEAVITT. These concessions are a source of revenue to the Indians. The land is withdrawn and can not be so handled. The concessions will result in the money going to the Indians.

Mr. STAFFORD. These concessions are of a temporary character. Some little boom going on, and some tradesmen want to get a lease on Indian lands while that boom is on for perhaps 5 or 10 years.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But the bill says no concession to exceed a period of 10 years. It seems to me that can hardly be called a short term.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, that is a short term. There is public work to be inaugurated out in the Indian country and some person wants to obtain a lease for 10 years to erect a temporary shack to sell merchandise and the like. It is impractical for the Secretary of the Interior to get the consent of the Indian tribe. That is a matter for immediate action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. In its present form I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LEAVITT. Does the gentleman wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I would like to give the Indians some say.

Mr. LEAVITT. That is what I intended by my committee amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman will offer the amendment which I suggested.

Mr. LEAVITT. I offered the amendment with reference to "consultation." I do not have authority to offer the amendment which the gentleman suggested. It is not my bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I object.

WATER SUPPLY, UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14201, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make a long-term contract for a supply of water to the United States naval station at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

STATE OF WYOMING

The Clerk called the next bill, S 3475, to amend section 5 of the act approved July 10, 1890 (28 Stat. 664) relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I am willing for the gentleman from Wyoming to make a statement if he desires, but I do not think we ought to amend any acts that created States by unanimous consent in the closing hours of Congress.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think we ought to amend any of the acts creating any States in the closing hours of

Congress, at a time when we can not carefully consider them, especially on a day like this, when most Members are thinking only of froth instead of having on their minds, and close to their hearts, subjects of more importance to the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

OSAGE INDIANS IN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3085, relating to the tribal and individual affairs of the Osage Indians of Oklahoma.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in a statement in the report the commissioner says:

Some question has been raised by attorneys for various oil companies as to the phraseology of the acts of 1906 and 1929 in regard to the extension of restrictions on trust property.

Can the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] give me some information as to this?

Mr. DISNEY. This is not my bill. I shall object to the bill unless it is amended.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I want to get some information on this point. I do not see just how these oil companies enter into this situation. Is there any gentleman here who can give me some information? The bill was reported by Mr. LOOFBOUROW.

Mr. HASTINGS. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In the first place, how do the attorneys for oil companies enter into the situation? Has the gentleman read the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs? It is February 15, 1932, transmitted in a letter from the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from New York knows that these oil leases in the Osage Tribe are put up and sold at public auction. The gentleman from New York probably knows also that the mineral rights are reserved to the tribe. I do not know the particular inquiry the gentleman from New York is making. I do not see where the attorneys for the oil companies should be interested, because the oil rights are reserved to the tribe. The leases are sold at public auction.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is not I who interjects the oil companies in this, it is the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. HASTINGS. My understanding is that this bill if changed by certain amendments that will be offered by the gentleman who represents the district, Mr. DISNEY, is entirely agreeable to the Indian Bureau.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May we have the proposed amendments read?

Mr. DISNEY. I shall be pleased to read them. The first section is agreeable, but I wish to offer an amendment on page 4. If anyone is going to object to the amendments I shall object to the bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman from Texas said he was going to object if any amendment was offered. I do not see the gentleman from Texas here.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; he is here.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. DISNEY. If he is going to object to the amendments I shall object to the bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May we hear the amendments read? I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma if he will tell us what his amendments are.

Mr. DISNEY. On page 4, line 3, after the words "Osage Tribe" insert "with the approval of the board of county commissioners."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Why is this amendment necessary?

Mr. DISNEY. This relates to the homestead laws and surplus lands. It is to effect a change of the taxation feature on these lands.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That undoes the very thing the gentleman is seeking to do, does it not?

Mr. DISNEY. No; it does not.

Mr. HASTINGS. The Osages have homestead lands that are exempt from taxation. The purpose of the amendment is to allow the exchange of homesteads with the consent of the county commissioners, as I understand it.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that particular? The bill provides that the exchanged land shall be of equal area. Has the gentleman any objection to inserting "of approximately equal value"?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is left to the discretion of the county commissioners and the Secretary of the Interior. They have to consent together.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What is the other amendment?

Mr. DISNEY. The next amendment is a similar amendment in line 10; and then, in lines 10 and 11 eliminate the words "or otherwise."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. So it will read:

That each tract after the change and designation shall take the status of the other as it existed prior to the change in designation, as to alienation, taxation, and that any order of change or designation, with the approval of the board of county commissioners, shall be recorded in the proper office of Osage County.

Mr. DISNEY. The next amendment is to add a new section, section 4.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration meets my approval, I believe, but if we are going to have a large number of amendments it will not.

Mr. DISNEY. Without the amendments I shall object to the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, let me say that as I understand these amendments they meet with the approval of the gentleman representing the district in which Osage County is located and they are offered with the approval of the Indian Office. The Indian Office has carefully studied these amendments, and I may say to the gentlemen from New York and the gentleman from Wisconsin that I am advised these amendments meet with the approval of the Indian Office.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I see no objection to the amendments requiring the approval of the county commissioners. What is the new section the gentleman proposes to add?

Mr. DISNEY. The next amendment is as follows:

Where a certificate of competency has or may hereafter be revoked or canceled in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Act of Congress approved February 27, 1925, such revocation shall not take effect as to creditors until the order revoking the same has been filed for record in the office of the county clerk of Osage County.

Mr. HASTINGS. There ought not to be any objection to that amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why were not these amendments given consideration in the committee? The gentleman is asking the House to accept amendments of very general character. Will the gentleman again read his last amendment, which I think is a rather important one?

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish it understood that I am reserving the right to object throughout the discussion of these amendments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly. The gentleman is only reading the amendment for information; he is not offering them. Will the gentleman read his last amendment again?

Mr. DISNEY. The last amendment reads:

Where a certificate of competency has or may hereafter be revoked or canceled in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the act of Congress approved February 27, 1925, such revocation shall not take effect as to creditors until the order revoking the same has been filed for record in the office of the county clerk of Osage County.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Just along this line, suppose a certificate of competency is properly revoked; suppose the individual is wholly incompetent and his certificate is withheld, would the gentleman dissipate all his property among creditors who dealt with the incompetent Indian?

Mr. DISNEY. No; this will operate as notice.

Mr. HASTINGS. I think the gentleman does not exactly understand it. If an Indian is declared competent now, of course he can pay his debts and ought to pay them.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; in other words, he has the right of contract.

Mr. HASTINGS. If, for instance, the Interior Department revokes the certificate of competency, it does not affect his creditors until notice is given and, of course, notice will be given by the certificate being recorded.

Mr. STAFFORD. Upon whom is the obligation to record it?

Mr. HASTINGS. The Indian Office will do that at once.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It ought to be done at once, because otherwise all the property of this Indian may be dissipated.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the effect of section 4 of the law of 1925 which is referred to in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DISNEY. That provides for the granting of a certificate or the cancellation of a certificate of competency.

Mr. HASTINGS. If a man is competent, he pays his debts and is subject to the payment of all legal obligations, and ought to be.

Mr. STAFFORD. But, as soon as he is declared competent, then his property should not be dissipated before proper notice is given.

Mr. HASTINGS. Of course, if it is revoked, public notice ought to be given at once and that will be done.

Mr. STAFFORD. Who is to give the public notice?

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, well—

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says, "Oh, well," but there is no provision in the gentleman's amendment to that effect.

Mr. HASTINGS. The Secretary of the Interior; and if the gentleman has any objection to the bill on that account, it can and will be amended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Such an amendment will not be objectionable.

Mr. DISNEY. Section 5—this is another amendment—where an Osage Indian headright or any interest therein has been acquired through inheritance, purchase, or otherwise, by any person, firm, or corporation, any person acquiring such headright or interest therein being not of Indian blood, it shall be lawful for any creditor of such person, firm, or corporation to cause a garnishment to issue and to garnishee any money owing any such person, firm, or corporation by the Osage agency or the Secretary of the Interior by reason of the ownership of such Indian headright or interest therein.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think that should be included. That is entirely foreign to this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, is it understood that all the amendments that were offered by the Department are going to be put in this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not section 5. If so, I shall have to object.

Mr. BLANTON. Unless the bureau amendments are going to be put in, I shall object.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman will not press the last amendment.

Mr. DISNEY. I am not pressing the bill. I am objecting to the bill unless the amendments are in it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to section 5 being incorporated in the bill.

Mr. DISNEY. Then I object to the bill.

ACCEPTANCE OF BEQUEST OF THE LATE WILLIAM F. EDGAR

The Clerk called the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 48) to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the bequest of the late William F. Edgar, of Los Angeles County, State of California, for the benefit of the museum and library connected with the office of the Surgeon General of the United States Army.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, may I make a friendly suggestion?

In the first place, there is no reference in the law as to the property involved. True you refer to it in your whereas clause. In the second place, you authorize the Secretary to receive this property as designated in the will, but you make no provision and give no authority to receive the accumu-

lated interest, whatever it may be, and there is some interest, because this money is on deposit.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, the money is in the bank drawing interest and whenever you authorize the department to accept the bequest, it accepts it just like it finds it, including the money and the interest.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. No; I am afraid not.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; especially with this expression of legislative intent put in the RECORD now.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. All right; now that the gentleman has the legislative intent in the RECORD, if the gentleman will look at the body of the bill he will note it says that "the Surgeon General of the United States Army be, and is hereby, authorized to accept the said bequest." This is the first time there is any reference to a bequest in the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. We ought to add an amendment describing it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I have prepared an amendment striking out the words "said bequest" and inserting the following: "The bequest of William F. Edgar, of Los Angeles County, Calif., as contained in his will and codicil thereto."

Mr. BLANTON. That is all right. That ought to be in there. That is a wise suggestion.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman does not believe "interest" is necessary?

Mr. BLANTON. I think that is carried with it, because it has been drawing interest and certainly the interest has become part of and goes with the principal, but he may make that plain also in his amendment.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then, if the gentleman pleases, the bill provides that this property, of course, is to be used for the purpose designated in the law. So I provide in line 8, after "codicil," insert the following: "copy of which shall be filed in the General Accounting Office." Then, of course, he can properly audit the expenditures.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; certainly. We will pass the amendments proposed by the gentleman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas by a codicil to his will the late William F. Edgar, of Los Angeles County, Calif., provided as follows:

"4. After the foregoing bequests are made I desire that the bulk of the funds in the hands of my trustees may go to the benefit of the museum and library of or connected with the office of the Surgeon General, United States Army, and I therefore revoke the bequest in the foregoing will and bequeath to said institution as follows. Second:

"I give and bequeath to these institutions to the extent of \$40,000, or what may be lawful in that amount, or if not lawful then less, but in the proportion as follows: To the museum connected with the office of the Surgeon General, United States Army, at Washington, District of Columbia, four-fifths of said amount above mentioned, and one-fifth of said amount I give and bequeath to said library connected with the same office."

Therefore be it—

Resolved, etc., That the Surgeon General of the United States Army be, and is hereby, authorized to accept the said bequest and to receipt therefor on behalf of the United States and to deposit the funds so received in the Treasury of the United States as a special fund dedicated to the purposes stated in said codicil, said fund to be subject to disbursement for such purposes upon vouchers submitted by the Surgeon General of the United States Army under authority of the Secretary of War and to be available until expended.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "accept," strike out the words "said bequest" and insert the following: "The bequest of William F. Edgar, of Los Angeles County, Calif., as contained in his will and testament and codicil thereto and such interest as may have accrued from the funds covered by such bequest."

In line 8, after the word "codicil," insert "a copy of which shall be filed in the General Accounting Office."

Mr. STAFFORD. I offer the following amendment to the LaGuardia amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "to" insert the word "late," so it shall read "the late William S. Edgar."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I ask unanimous consent that the whereases be stricken out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TO CONFER DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE UPON GRADUATES OF THE NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk read the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 13367, to confer the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the Naval Academy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

PAN-AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

The Clerk read the next resolution on the Consent Calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 243, authorizing the President of the United States to extend a welcome to the Pan-American Medical Association, which is to hold its convention in the United States in March, 1933.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized on behalf of the Government of the United States to extend a welcome to the Pan-American Medical Association, which is to hold its fourth congress, being its first congress held in an English-speaking nation, at Dallas, Tex., from March 21 to March 25, 1933.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATION FOR LI PO-TIEN

The Clerk read the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 14323, authorizing an appropriation to the Government of China for the account of Li Po-tien.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

The Clerk read the next resolution on the Consent Calendar, House Joint Resolution 536, authorizing an appropriation for participation by the United States in an international monetary and economic conference to be held in London.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object. This would be \$150,000 wasted.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve it, but I want to say that just now we should stay out of Europe. We ought just now to keep our people out of Europe. To spend \$150,000 on this conference would be foolish in the extreme, and might involve us in most serious complications.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to say that statements like that made on the floor of the House are reflected all over the world. I want to say to the gentleman that this conference was suggested by the United States Government. It has the approval of the incoming administration. It is to be one of the most important conferences that ever has taken place.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I know how much this Government spent foolishly in Europe last year, and I know that nothing was accomplished, and to spend this additional \$150,000 would be a waste, and it would be utterly foolish.

If we do not keep our so-called diplomats out of Europe, they are going to embarrass us in many ways. They will involve us in a situation where it will be contended by those special interests that would benefit by hundreds of millions overnight for foreign debts to be canceled, that our Government is obligated by some commitment they made, to grant some additional concession respecting debts, even if they do not go so far as to demand outright cancellation.

Then, too, with conditions disturbed as they are both in Europe and the Far East, some unwise move or statement made by Americans there could involve us in serious complications, and as one Member of this Congress I am going to

insist that we stay at home for a while and attend strictly to our own business.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The time to have kept out of Europe was in 1917.

Mr. BLANTON. And another very opportune time to keep out is right now, at least for a while. I object. I may not stop the passage of this bill if a rule is presented, but I can stop its passage now. I object.

STATUARY HALL

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Concurrent Resolution 47.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 47

Where each State may have statues of two of its distinguished citizens placed in Statuary Hall; and

Whereas the weight of the statues already placed therein is so great as seriously to endanger the stability of Statuary Hall, so that a number of those statues should be removed; and

Whereas certain States have applied for representation, and such requests must either be declined or deferred until proper provision for the reception of the statues from them can be made: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol, upon the approval of the Joint Committee on the Library, with the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, is hereby authorized and directed to relocate within the Capitol any of the statues already received and placed in Statuary Hall, and to provide for the reception and location of the statues received hereafter from the States.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I do that for the purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS], a question in respect to House Joint Resolution 536, which has just been objected to. The title of the joint resolution is for an appropriation for participation by the United States in an international monetary and economic conference. Last year when the appropriation was made, it was made for an international monetary conference, including silver. I rise to ask if the gentleman will consent to a change in this joint resolution when it is passed, as it will be finally, to conform to that.

Mr. BLANTON. It is not going to be passed by unanimous consent. It may be passed by a rule.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I am asking the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee a question.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Personally, I have no objection. I see no reason for it, however, because of the fact that the agenda includes silver, and it has been passed in the Senate in its present form.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. I call the gentleman's attention to the present appropriation that is running for this purpose. It is for participation by the United States in an international monetary conference, including silver. That was passed on the first of July, 1932, and if the appropriation to be authorized here is to continue for the same purpose I suggest to the gentleman that the text ought to be exactly the same.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But it is not the same convention at all.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. It is a broader convention. The question of silver is included in the agenda.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. EATON] weakens his case by insisting on silver being included in that way, because he will connote the idea that silver to-day is not before the monetary conference.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I wish the gentleman from Tennessee would put the agenda and all of the information that he has in respect to it in the RECORD, because apparently some Members of the House do not know that negotiations have been carried on for the purpose of bringing about this conference and the necessity for it. I think that all of the information ought to be put into the RECORD.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows how many other questions are connected with the agenda now. Eventually,

the one of most importance to Europe will be the cancellation of honest debts they owe us.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I do; but I am not afraid to face representatives of other countries, because we are living in this world to-day, and we can not isolate ourselves as if we were on some far-off planet.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not all there is to it, and the gentleman knows that. I am against permitting any step to be taken which might end in cancellation of debts Europe now owes us.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The agenda is as follows: First, monetary and credit policy; second, prices; third, resumption of the movement of capital; fourth, restrictions of international trade; fifth, tariff and treaty policy; sixth, organization of production and trade. The gentleman will see from that that "monetary" will include silver, and there is a further discussion by experts in reference to this matter, including silver. Recently India and China have joined in this world conference, and experts on the silver question will be sent from this country.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Then, I understand the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee has no objection to it?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I have no objection to it, but I do not see the reason for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think it would be a mistake to change the wording to include silver in that way. Why not include copper pennies? The gentleman is weakening his case.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. The question is entirely different from that of copper pennies.

Mr. JENKINS. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] expect to adopt some other proceeding by which this bill may be passed?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I certainly do. I shall either go before the Committee on Rules or ask the Speaker of the House to recognize me for suspension of the rules.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, I believe if the gentleman would wait a while, and call this bill up again, we can pass it at this time. I am sure the gentleman from Texas, who is a very able and intelligent and useful legislator, will get over his temporary peevishness by that time and will go along with us.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New York ought to know that the prime purpose of European nations to-day is to get us into a conference over yonder for the purpose of canceling our foreign debts. And I am not going to allow any measure to pass by unanimous consent that may even tend to bring that about.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But we control that situation.

Mr. BLANTON. We can not control it at all, and that is the reason I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the preamble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Strike out the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to, and the concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CHANGING THE NAVY RATION

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14438) to effect needed changes in the Navy ration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, now that we have attended to Statuary Hall, I want to ask the gentleman the necessity of this bill at this time. After all, we provide and appropriate for rations. It seems to me it makes it too rigid if we define the quantity and particular food. I notice with a great deal of interest the salt pork has been reduced and cream and chicken have been added.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will examine the law, he will find now that the ration is prescribed by statute, and the object and purpose of this is to change the present statute and permit the addition of more vegetables and different kinds of rations which the law to-day requires to be fed.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I do not object to that. Is this based upon a matter of nourishment or one of delicacies?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is based upon nourishment and economy.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I can see no objection to that.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I will object unless the gentleman wishes me to reserve it—this bill absolutely nullifies the law with reference to the amount that can be expended for rations. That will be seen in section 4.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman intends to object, I trust he will object and not take up the time of the committee.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NEW SITES FOR COURTS AND POST OFFICE, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

The Clerk called the next business (H. R. 14321) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion to acquire a new site in Huntsville, Ala., and to construct a building thereon for the accommodation of the courts, post office, and other Government offices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, where does the gentleman get any authority from the Department of Justice that approves of this, and requires that the sessions of the court will be held there?

Mr. ALMON. They are held there now by law. Regardless of this bill, the courts will be held there in the new building.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Why have we a specific bill on this one when we have a complete building program?

Mr. ALMON. I will explain it in just a minute, briefly. I may say that this bill was written in the Treasury Department and sent to me and I introduced it, and the bill had a unanimous report from the committee. The Treasury Department now has authority to buy or condemn property adjacent to the building and build it on the old site, but the price of that property adjacent to the old building is so unreasonably high that they have asked permission here to buy a new site. If that permission is given, it will enable the Government to buy a lot and build a house on it and save the old house, worth at least \$50,000.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. My reference was to another bill. I was confused on the bills.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. If this bill is passed, what effect will that have on the appropriation that is now made?

Mr. ALMON. It will not affect it at all. They can not expend to exceed the amount allocated for that building, \$234,000.

Mr. JENKINS. I knew of another case somewhat like this; and it struck me that, if the appropriation was made to erect a post-office building on the old site, the money could not be used to erect a post-office building on another site.

Mr. ALMON. By passing this bill it gives the Treasury Department the authority to do that in another part of the town and save the old site and the old building. If we do not pass this bill, it will force the Government to buy property adjacent to the old site, which will cost the Government a great deal more money. It will cost more than the new site, which will be in another part of the town.

Mr. JENKINS. Did I understand the gentleman to say this bill was drawn by the Treasury Department?

Mr. ALMON. It was, and I introduced it at the request of the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to acquire a new site in Huntsville, Ala., and to construct a building thereon for the accommodation of the courts, post office, and other Government offices, at a cost not to exceed the sum of \$234,000, in lieu of the acquisition of additional land, demolition of building, and construction of a new building within said limit of cost fixed under authority of the act approved July 21, 1932, as modified by the act approved June 30, 1932.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL BUILDING, BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

The Clerk called the next resolution, House Joint Resolution 583, to provide for a change of site of the Federal building to be constructed at Binghamton, N. Y.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, I see there is no report from either department on this bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. This resolution was drawn after much collaboration by the Treasury Department and also two committees of the House, namely, the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in cooperation with the citizens of Binghamton, N. Y. It is a matter of mutual agreement whereby we are trying to do what the people want without increasing the limit of cost that has already been made.

Mr. JENKINS. That is information that is not in the report.

Mr. LANHAM. They have collaborated with us.

Mr. JENKINS. With that understanding, I will withdraw the reservation of objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds inform us how much land is to be taken from the site for street purposes?

Mr. LANHAM. It is set forth in the last paragraph of the bill. Practically all of this new site is now owned by the Government, and at the time of its acquisition the people of Binghamton themselves contributed \$20,000 toward its purchase.

Mr. STAFFORD. Which the report discloses; but the report does not show how much of this old site is going to be donated to the city for street purposes.

Mr. MEAD. None of the old site. It is a part of the new site, in order to straighten out the street. It is at an angle, and they gave them a small strip of land on one side, none on the other, to straighten the street in front of the post office.

Mr. STAFFORD. Just a small portion of the new tract?

Mr. MEAD. Just a small portion of the new tract.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then what was the need of this unusual provision that after the new post-office building has been occupied, no rental postal station shall be maintained within 2,000 feet?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, that is a matter of economy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not question that; but what is the need of incorporating it as legislation?

Mr. LANHAM. There is at present a postal substation, operated at a cost of almost \$10,000 a year. This new site is in the center of the business district, and we are advised that no substation will be necessary. Consequently there will be an annual saving of approximately \$10,000 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has no fear that this will not be taken as a slight on the incoming administration as to their position for economy and that they can not be relied upon? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANHAM. Well, I think we can rely upon the judgment of those who have collaborated with us in that regard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause the new Federal building at Binghamton, N. Y. (authorized by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1931, approved March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1587)), to be erected on the Government-owned site located on the north side of Henry Street and extending northwardly between Washington and State Streets, in lieu of on the site of the present post-office building. For such purpose the Secretary is authorized and directed to (a) cancel the existing contract or contracts for the erection of such new building and make a settlement with the contractor for damages sustained by him as the result of such cancellation, or (b) effect a modification of such contract or contracts to provide for construction of the new building on the Henry Street site, and allow reasonable additional compensation for any damages or increased costs occasioned the contractor by the change to such new site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized and directed to purchase additional land necessary to permit the construction of such new building on the Henry Street site.

SEC. 3. All obligations incurred and/or expenditures made in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution shall be limited to the amount made available and fixed by existing law for the demolition of the old building and construction of such new building, and shall not be in excess of such amount.

SEC. 4. After occupancy of the new building constructed pursuant to this joint resolution, no rented postal station shall be maintained within 2,000 feet of such building.

SEC. 5. The act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Binghamton, N. Y.," approved May 13, 1930 (46 Stat. 273), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer by the usual quitclaim deed to the city of Binghamton, N. Y., the southerly triangular portion (measuring approximately 59.84 feet on Washington Street and 159.75 feet on Henry Street), or such portion thereof as the Secretary may deem practicable, for the purpose of straightening out said Henry Street, of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in such city, fronting on the north side of Henry Street and extending northwardly between Washington and State Streets."

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE OF THE WOODS

The Clerk called the next Senate joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 124, to provide for the determination of claims for damages sustained by the fluctuation of the water levels of Lake of the Woods in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes under reservation of objection. I wish to make some observations on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a casual reading of the bill and the report would lead to the conclusion that the Government is under an obligation to pay the claims that have been determined by the Secretary of War; but if you refer to the report of the Secretary of War as found in House Document No. 774 of the Seventy-first Congress, third session, on which this resolution is predicated, you will come to the conclusion that there has never been a more outrageous attempt to get money out of the Treasury of the United States than this.

What are the facts? Long before any settlers settled around the Lake of the Woods the lake levels were raised, and raised higher than they were at the time when the treaty was entered into between Canada and the United States. In 1892 artificial barriers were placed in the Rainy River, 36 miles from the international border, that raised the lake level 5 feet. That dam was partially washed away afterwards, but still the water level was raised nearly 3 feet.

I call your attention to the report of the Secretary of War, in which a tabulation showing high-water levels is printed. This is found on page 3. The extreme high-water natural levels prior to 1892—and, remember, the treaty was not entered into until 1915—was 1,062½ feet. The level fixed by the treaty is 1,062½ feet.

These lands on the Lake of the Woods were never opened to entry until 1910 and 1915, and now these persons who have entered on these lands are seeking to put their hands into the Treasury of the United States based upon a state-

ment in the treaty that if there were any claims for flowage the United States would pay the claims of its citizens and the Canadians would pay claims arising on the Canadian side.

I took occasion to read this report of the Secretary of War. It covers 12 pages. I have read the treaty also. If you but read the report accompanying this resolution you would come to the conclusion that this is a meritorious claim presented to Congress a few years back for damage arising from flowage, but let me read you what the Secretary of War said in this connection:

Settlement on the United States shore was not authorized until after the lake level had been raised. The lands on the south and west shores were opened October 5, 1898, and those in the north-west angle on June 15, 1894.

I read another paragraph:

These facts create the impression that speculation with the hope of obtaining flowage damages prompted some of these entries.

Their idea was that the land having been overflowed they might be able to make some claim for damage by reason of Canada having raised the level long before they had ever entered upon the land. Let me read one further paragraph:

The greater part of the lands have undergone practically no change since they were opened to settlement. Except for the opening of a few farms on the south shore near Warroad on Zippel Creek, and at some other widely scattered points, agricultural activities along the lake shores are slight. Within the zone subject to overflow in the past years, including a total of 39,620 acres of privately owned land, only about 300 acres have at any time been broken by the plow.

I invite your attention to this report if you really want to see how easy it is for covert interests to get their hands under the tent and grab some of the money out of the Treasury. There is no basis whatsoever for the payment of this \$77,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. The reason I am taking the floor on this matter at this time is because I am going out of Congress and I wish to call the attention of the membership of this House to what I regard as an outrageous claim. I ascertained these facts only after digging back in the records. I do not incorporate in the RECORD matters that I uncover, but I take the floor to call attention to the facts in cases which I consider important. With my multitudinous duties it is impossible for me to incorporate these things in extensions of remarks.

Mr. PETTINGILL. Does the gentleman know how many of these claimants are dead, insane, or have assigned their claims at a discount?

Mr. STAFFORD. No one had a claim to damage from flowage when they entered upon the land. At that time the level had been raised, yet they are seeking to get nearly \$100,000, basing their claim upon matters which give them no right to assert any claim at all.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just preceded me acts as though he were giving the House something new. He was not a Member of this House in 1926, I believe. Is that correct?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. At that time I was on the subcommittee and opposed this bill. I brought those facts before the House at that time, with the insistence that these people who had made the entries there after the water level had been raised were entitled to no damages. I succeeded finally in getting an amendment by which it should be reported back to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in that

it provided that the Secretary of War should assess these damages. It was over my protest, because I did not think there was a liability on the part of the Government, but after it was heard in this House it was passed and became the law. Since that time various efforts have been made before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to get this shifted from our committee to the courts.

You will note in this bill that we amended that was the purpose, and the claims they were making were for something like \$800,000 for damages; but on account of this statute, and feeling we were bound by this statute, we brought this bill out under reports of the Secretary of War that these were the damages that should be paid. It is for this reason that this bill has been reported, and if you are ever going to get rid of it, and unless you are going to nullify that statute, you should pass this bill and let these people get advantage of it.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. I ask the gentleman to yield at this moment because I know we are proceeding on what amounts to a unanimous-consent calendar, and because I was the author of a bill for Lake of the Woods claimants and I was on the floor and heard my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. He is incorrect in everything he says about this bill except as to the unfair attitude of the War Department. I have a high regard for my colleague from Wisconsin, and he is ordinarily right; but I want to say, and I shall have to leave it in the RECORD if he leaves his remarks there, that I have never seen him so misinformed on any subject since I have been in Congress as he is on this subject. I regret I will not be permitted to argue this on its merits. My colleague has not had the advantage of hours and hours of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not care what he says about me, but his language is a reflection on the integrity of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There has never been a more meritorious bill on behalf of any claimants than the one that passed the Senate and was before this committee, in this case. The committee did what they thought was proper, and did not do what we asked, namely, give American citizens their day in court. I want to say that that is the very essence of Americanism, and yet the committee was conscientious and so strict that they would not even give us that right and they adhered to arbitrary findings of the War Department engineers. My colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is entirely mistaken as to the facts in this case.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to state this in conclusion. I never thought at any time there was any legal liability, and the records will show that I made this fight some six years ago, but the House did not agree with me. The act of 1926, passed in reference to the Lake of the Woods, provided that the Secretary of War should make investigations as to the damages to the property overflowed by the lake and report that amount back to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. It took the Secretary of War some two or three years to have this investigation and appraisals of damages to all the different properties and finally did make this report to your committee. While this investigation was being made by the War Department, as provided by statute, various bills were introduced before your committee by Members of the House from Minnesota, insisting that these matters be left to the courts of the State. In each instance these bills were defeated, because your committee knew that damages in large amounts were claimed and felt that an injustice would be done the Government if it was not determined by the War Department as provided. This bill, as reported out, was opposed by the Members of Congress interested in this matter, from Minnesota, but your committee felt that the amounts reported by the War Department were just if liability of the Government was granted in accordance with the act of 1926; and in order to get this matter settled after some six years, I feel that this bill should be passed. I have not yet changed my mind as to the original liability

of the Government; but, having made my fight some six years ago along the lines then that the gentleman from Wisconsin now undertakes to enlighten the House and my position having been overridden and this statute passed, your committee, in making this report, is merely following the law in reference to this matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MODOC NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, when we began the call of the calendar this afternoon it was agreed that the bill (H. R. 189) to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest in the State of California would be passed over without prejudice. I ask that that bill be called now.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 189) to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, in the State of California.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from California in just what way the whole people of the United States will be benefited by incorporating this 640 acres of land in the Modoc National Forest?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It is intended to add this 640 acres of land to the national forest for a possible exchange of land for purposes of watershed protection and fire protection. This is an area that is adjacent to the national forest and is in private ownership. It is cut-over land. It is a fire menace, and to properly administer the timber of the people of the United States it is desired to add this land so that proper protection may be given to it by the Forest Service.

Mr. BLANTON. Why did not the department send this bill here?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It is approved by the department.

Mr. BLANTON. Why did not the department send the bill here, if it were a Government matter?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It has been approved by the department.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but it was introduced here not by the department but by the gentleman at the instance of some one, I do not know whom.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. No; not by the department.

Mr. BLANTON. At whose instance was the bill introduced?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. It was introduced primarily after talking with the officials of the Forest Service in this locality.

Mr. BLANTON. But the talk came from the gentleman to the officials, and not from the officials to the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. No; it was the other way around. It came from the officials to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the United States Government officials bring this question up themselves?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. After I had discussed with them fire-protection matters in that vicinity, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the suggestion from the department followed a conversation that the gentleman had with them.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman suggest this would help the situation?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. As a matter of general fire protection in that locality, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman in mind any interest or any individual there that may be involved?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I have not the slightest idea in whom ownership may be.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there any particular individual that the gentleman had in mind who would be interested in getting this done?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I have not any idea who the owner may be.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. No; I have not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the bill was originally under consideration I stated that four entries had been made on this 640 acres of

land, and I assume this is to grant the right to these four entrymen to take other lands.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. If an exchange can be worked out, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why should the Government give consideration to these four entrymen on this section of land?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Because it has been the policy throughout the forest reserves to make exchanges where it is to the advantage of the forest reserve for administration purposes, for consolidations, watershed protection, or fire protection.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have been objecting to similar bills of much larger extent where they sought to take in hundreds of thousands of acres. This is a small parcel, it is true, and I did not know but what there may be some exceptional conditions that would warrant our receding from the position we have taken heretofore in objecting to such omnibus extension bills.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Yes; this is land that is in an intense fire area. The fire menace in this locality every year is very severe, and we are endeavoring to extend protection so as to keep down fires in the national forests and protect Government timber.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then there is a special condition of affairs pertaining to this section that warrants our extending the forest borders to this section of land?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. That is my opinion.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, the department recommends the striking out of everything on line 3 after the word "that" down to and including the word "resource" in line 1, on page 2. I have an amendment to carry this out.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. That is satisfactory.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to any existing valid claims or entries, all lands of the United States in the areas hereinafter described be, and the same are hereby, added to and made parts of the Modoc National Forest, in the State of California, to be hereafter administered under the laws and regulations relating to the national forests, for the purpose of production of timber, regulation of stream flow, and the improvement and utilization of the forage resource; and the provisions of the act approved March 20, 1922 (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 486, 487), entitled "An act to consolidate national forest lands," as amended, are hereby extended and made applicable to all other lands within the said described area: Northeast quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter, east half southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter, section 15; and the east half northeast quarter, section 22; all in township 39 north, range 11 east, Modoc County, Calif., Mount Diablo base and meridian.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: On page 1, in line 3, after the word "That" strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 4 to 9, inclusive; and on page 2, line 1, strike out the words "utilization of the forage resource."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "other" and in the same line strike out the word "said" and after the word "the" and before the word "described" insert the word "following."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

FUTURE TRADING IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

The Clerk called the next business on the Consent Calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 108, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the cost of maintaining the present system of future trading in agricultural products, and to ascertain what classes of citizens bear such costs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PRIVATE AERIAL LAW

The Clerk called the next business on the Consent Calendar, House Joint Resolution 568, a joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the expenses of participation by the United States in the third international conference on private aerial law to be held in Rome, Italy, in 1933.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

ACQUISITION OF LAND IN THE VICINITY OF CAMP BULLIS, TEX.

The Clerk read the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 12769, to provide an additional authorization for the acquisition of land in the vicinity of Camp Bullis, Tex.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, how many artillery ranges have we in operation?

Mr. McSWAIN. I am sorry I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I remember when the original bill was up for the acquisition of this property, it was said it was the only artillery range, and I remember another instance where the appropriation was for a cavalry or machine-gun field, and found out later that it was not wanted. I am trying to ascertain if this artillery range is a necessary one.

Mr. McSWAIN. This would not be adequate for an artillery range. The artillery field in North Carolina contains 122 acres.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The report says that it is an addition to the Leon Springs target and maneuver reservation. It says that the War Department continued to occupy the Neutze tract under lease at an annual rental of \$650, owing to the fact that the use of this area is necessary as a firing point for artillery. Have they any artillery down there?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that San Antonio is one of the finest cities in the world in which to live, and the officers and their wives want to live there because there is always plenty of society there. That was why the Army moved our cavalry from the Rio Grande, where it was needed to protect us from border raiders, to the East, where we have no need for it. They wanted to be near high society.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. I am with the gentleman from Texas, but I want to say that Camp Marfa was not deserted for that reason; those troops went to Kentucky.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; so as to be near the big cities.

Mr. JENKINS. What has the abandonment of Camp Marfa to do with this?

Mr. HILL of Alabama. It has nothing to do with this. The truth is this land has been condemned by the Government in the United States district court, and judgment awarded the owners, and we are paying interest on the judgment.

Mr. BLANTON. Moving our cavalry has this to do with it. They were moved from the Rio Grande without any excuse or justification whatever, and I merely wanted to give notice to the Army that sooner or later they are going to be forced to return there, hence they had better keep their property there intact.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman points out that this is a large concentration of our land forces.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is all right. I think we would save a great deal if we did concentrate in four or five points rather than have these sparsely located small posts and garrisons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection, and the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to the sum of \$15,000 authorized by the act of January 12, 1929, to be appropriated for the acquisition by the Secretary of War in the vicinity of and for use in connection with the present military reservation at Camp Bullis, Tex., and which was appropriated in the War Department appropriation act for the fiscal year 1931, there is authorized to be appropriated for the same purpose, to meet the judgment in condemnation proceedings, an additional sum of not to exceed \$6,400, together with such amount as may be necessary to pay interest.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RESCINDING CERTAIN NEW AIR MAIL CONTRACTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Resolution 359, to rescind certain new air mail contracts, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes to explain the resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the House authorized the Post Office Committee to make an investigation of all postal facilities. One of those investigated was air mail. We have gone into this question very extensively, and we are ready now to make our report. Along about the latter part of January information reached us that the Postmaster General was going to make a number of changes in the air mail map, that he contemplated extending a number of lines, and that he intended to create a number of new lines. We believed that it was the wrong time to make such changes. We had made a complete survey of all the air mail lines and were ready to make our recommendations based on lines then in existence.

The Appropriations Committee of the House was considering appropriations based on the then existing lines, and our committee, believing it was inopportune for an administration in its closing days to radically change the air mail service, reported out this resolution. We then asked the Postmaster General to leave the service as it was at least for the time being. It was not the proper thing to do just at this time. Some there are who even suggest that it was a discourteous act, unfair to the incoming administration. But he put his program through and for good measure he put a number of new ocean mail contracts into effect, one from Galveston to the Orient, an ocean mail contract that could not possibly carry much mail, for if mail was to be expedited, such mail to the Orient would leave from the Pacific coast rather than from Galveston to go via the Panama Canal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand a bid is being opened to-day for the awarding of a mail contract from Norfolk, Va., up along the Atlantic coast and then over to Europe.

Mr. MEAD. I believe the gentleman is correct. The present administration is doing everything possible to extend both the air mail and the ocean mail systems, which will increase the subsidies.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does he expect that this resolution would have any legal consequence if it were passed? If the Postmaster General has a right to do something and has done it, how can anything we pass be other than just a simple request that he rescind?

Mr. MEAD. The members of the Post Office Committee went on record in opposition to the action taken by the Postmaster General when we adopted this resolution. We felt it was the only course for us to pursue. The next Postmaster General, by reason of the authority he possesses, backed up by the action of the Post Office Committee, may be able to make changes that will eliminate much of the harm that has been done.

Mr. JENKINS. Then the gentleman agrees that there can not be any legislative effect to this if we should pass it. And I shall object.

Mr. MEAD. Suppose the House and the Senate should pass this resolution, or a similar resolution. Does the gentleman believe the Postmaster General would overrule the Congress? It is an expression by which our committee seeks to inform the Postmaster General that he is exceeding his

powers. These changes should not be made until the appropriation for air mail is decided upon and until our committee has made its report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the fact that if he should introduce a resolution or amend this resolution providing that from the date of the enactment of this kind would be conclusive on the Postmaster General. The gentleman knows that we wrote a prohibitory provision in one of the appropriation bills in respect to a certain contract and the Postmaster General disregarded it. I suggest in a spirit of friendliness that if the gentleman will revise his resolution to prevent the issuance of certificates or the making of contracts after its passage I think the House would respond to it.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Where negotiations have been entered into for needed extensions, do I understand that this resolution would express the opinion of the House and the Congress that they should not be entered into?

Mr. MEAD. Where they are contrary to law and not in the public interest. That is all.

Mr. LEAVITT. Who would decide whether they were in the public interest or not?

Mr. MEAD. The Postmaster General, under the terms of the Watrous Act.

Mr. LEAVITT. I would have to object if this would interfere with the establishing of what I consider an extremely important program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MORRISTOWN NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK, N. J.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14302, to provide for the creation of the Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over. There has been a rule introduced for its consideration.

Mr. FULLER. Will the gentleman not reserve his objection for a moment? It will only take a short time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, there are 40 bills here where there is no rule at all. This matter will be considered in due course.

I object to the present consideration, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL BUILDING AT MANGUM, OKLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14489, relating to the construction of a Federal building at Mangum, Okla.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, this is the bill I referred to a few moments ago, which I got confused with another Federal building bill. I see there is a letter here to the gentleman from Oklahoma by the assistant chief clerk, with reference to the attitude of the Department of Justice. How does the assistant chief clerk come to speak for the department?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will permit, I will give a brief history of the legislation and the gentleman can understand the facts in connection therewith. A bill was passed through this body allocating eighty or ninety thousand dollars to be used in the construction of a post office at Mangum, Okla. That bill contemplated the purchasing of a site. The citizens of that city afterwards decided they would be willing to condemn and donate a portion of their large public square for this purpose, thus eliminating or avoiding the necessity for purchasing a site,

and making the amount for that purchase available to put an extra room on the top of the post-office building. I took it up with the Treasury Department. They thought well of it and instructed the architect to draw new plans.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I have all of that. That is clear. What I want to know is, does the Federal court hold sessions in this city?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Where do they hold their sessions now?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In the courthouse.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Why did we not have the benefit of the usual communication from the Department of Justice instead of a communication from the chief clerk?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The Assistant Attorney General of the Department of Justice instructed this person to look over the plans and see whether or not they were satisfactory. When he did that, this is the letter that was sent to me. I presented this letter to the committee, and the committee unanimously authorized this bill to be reported.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman assures us that the Federal court does hold sessions in this city?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes, sir.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. And at the present time there is no Federal building there?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the construction of the Federal building at Mangum, Okla., authorized by the act of February 16, 1931 (Doc. No. 788, 71st Cong.), the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to provide facilities for the holding of terms of the District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 546, TITLE 34, OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 13026, to amend section 546, title 34, of the United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, who drew up this bill? The Navy Department drew it, did it not?

Mr. BLAND. No. I had the honor of preparing the bill.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May I suggest the gentleman amends a provision of the United States Code? The United States Code is prima facie evidence of the law. I have prepared an amendment of the original statute, and if the gentleman would offer that, it would answer the purpose.

Mr. BLAND. I will be very glad to offer the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 546, title 34, of the United States Code, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 546. Loan or gift of condemned or obsolete property: The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to lend or give to soldiers' monument associations, posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, posts of the American Legion, and other recognized war veteran associations, State museums and incorporated museums operated and maintained for educational purpose only, whose charter denies them the right to operate for profit, and municipal corporations condemned or obsolete ordnance, guns, projectiles, books, manuscripts, works of art, drawings, plans, models, and other condemned or obsolete material which may not be needed in the service of the Navy Department. Such loan or gift shall be made subject to rules and regulations covering the same, and the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLAND: On page 1, line 3, after the word "That" insert "chapter 231 of the code of May 22, 1896 (29 Stat. 133)," and after the word "Code," in said line, insert a parenthesis.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment, after the numeral "34," strike out the word "Code" and insert "U. S. C."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: On page 1, line 3, after the numerals "34," strike out the word "Code" and insert "U. S. C."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "To amend section 546, title 34, U. S. C."

MIXED CLAIMS COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND GERMANY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 12328, to authorize the assignment of awards entered by the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the bill for the return of property and for the settlement of claims was before the House, if I remember correctly, there was quite a long discussion as to the matter of assignments, and the bill specifically provided against assignments and provided that payments could be made only to the original claimants.

The report states, and I suppose it is quite correct, that most of the small claims have been paid. What I fear is that there may be a peddling of these claims if we permit assignments in these times. Of course, it is presumed that the large claimants can protect their own interests.

Can the gentleman from Virginia tell us the necessity of this bill at the present time?

Mr. WOODRUM. Originally there were about 7,000 claims aggregating millions of dollars. It ran into quite a considerable sum. All claims under \$100,000 have now been paid in full. There are something less than 350 claims left out of the original 7,000; and they are all very large claims. Some of these claimants have received partial payments.

The Treasury Department, I may say to the gentleman from New York, has gone into the matter a number of times and for a while resisted any effort to change this law until they were fully advised that all the small claimants had been paid, and that the large claimants were able to protect themselves. Under present economic conditions they may be able to liquidate some of these claims to some extent at this time, and that is the reason the Treasury Department made this recommendation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Do the hearings disclose that anything unfair was being done, that anybody was trying to take advantage of the bankruptcy laws, or anything of that sort?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not at all.

Mr. JENKINS. Or whether this would enable some of the larger ones to squeeze out the smaller ones?

Mr. WOODRUM. The Treasury Department absolutely satisfied themselves that it would enable some of these claim holders to settle their claims at a time when they needed to take advantage of all the assets they had.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, I have read the bill and the report. I find no indication that it has been submitted to the State Department for its consideration. The State Department has the administration of the Mixed Claims Commission. It is not for the Treasury Department to pass on this.

Mr. WOODRUM. But the Treasury Department has always exercised jurisdiction over the payment of these claims.

Mr. STAFFORD. They only exercised jurisdiction as the last alternative. The State Department has full jurisdiction over the administration of the Mixed Claims Commission.

Mr. WOODRUM. But the inhibition against the assignment of claims was directed by the Treasury Department because it made the payments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course it might be said the Treasury Department had jurisdiction over every department in making payments out of the Treasury. The Treasury Department makes payments, but this, as a matter of administrative policy should have been submitted to the State Department.

Has the gentleman any information as to what attitude the State Department takes toward this legislation?

Mr. WOODRUM. No; because it has not been submitted to them.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill should really have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and not to the Committee on Ways and Means. It is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No; the Committee on Ways and Means reported out the bill. I remember we debated it for several days.

Mr. STAFFORD. The original authorization of the creation of the Mixed Claims Commission came from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is a matter that relates to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. WOODRUM. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am sure the Committee on Ways and Means reported it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (g) of section 2 of the settlement of war claims act of 1928 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(5) In the case of an assignment of an award, or an assignment (prior to the making of the award) of the claim in respect of which the award was made, by any such person, made in writing, duly acknowledged, and filed with the application for payment, such payment shall be made to the assignee."

Sec. 2. Subsection (k) of section 3 of such act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(5) In the case of an assignment of an award, or an assignment (prior to the making of the award) of the claim in respect of which the award was made, by any such person, made in writing, duly acknowledged and filed with the application for payment, such payment shall be made to the assignee."

Sec. 3. Subsection (f) of section 5 and subsection (h) of section 6 of such act are hereby amended by striking out "(4)" where it occurs in such subsections and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the assignment of awards entered by the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, the Tripartite Claims Commission, and the war claims arbiter."

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7432, to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to delegate certain of its powers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is a departure here from the established practice. Perhaps it is meritorious. It is sought to allocate to mere employees the power of hearing and determination.

I fully realize the crowded condition of the work before the Interstate Commerce Commission, yet there is a tendency on the part of the courts, as exemplified years back in the Court of Claims, in the Supreme Court of the United States, and other courts, to have subordinates do the real work of ascertainment and determination.

I would like to have some explanation of this bill, even though the Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended it in several of their reports.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman having been a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for years understands the way the commission works. He understands, of course, that the years have come and gone

since he was a member of that committee, and by close contact with the Interstate Commerce Commission that their work has grown by leaps and bounds. Many small matters come up for consideration in the commission. A few years ago we passed a law giving them the right to delegate this power to a section of the commission not less than three. We thought that would relieve the calendar, but it has not done so.

This bill provides for the delegation of authority in certain classes of cases to one commissioner or to a board of employees of the commission. As is set forth in the report there are little disputes about demurrage; there are little disputes about freight, and so forth, and so forth. We believe if power to handle these cases were delegated to one commissioner or a board of employees of the commission having to do with the particular subject matter that the parties involved could get together and compromise the matter.

Furthermore, when this authority is delegated to one commissioner, or when it is delegated to a board of employees in the commission, it is not final if anyone objects. If any party litigant to a proceeding makes the objection, then the full commission must consider the entire matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to a modification of the law delegating the investigation to one commissioner or perhaps to a board of employees, but this bill goes further than that. It allows one employee, no matter who he may be, to have full authority to investigate and determine. I think it should be a board of employees if we are going to delegate this investigational authority to these subalterns.

Mr. RAYBURN. There may be an occasion arise 1,000 miles from Washington, a most insignificant case, where they could send one man out there to get the information instead of sending a board of three or four or half a dozen. This would save money and would save time and the report of the employee delegated, if it were not agreed to by all the parties, would be referred to the commission or to a division of the commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under existing practice, is it not customary for the commission to delegate investigational affairs to one examiner who reports back to the commission?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not that existing practice meet the condition?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; it would not, because the examiner usually goes into rate matters. They go off and hold hearings for a month at Dallas, Tex., or Houston, Tex., or Los Angeles, Calif., on very vital matters.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do not limit it to Texas. They also go to Milwaukee and various other cities.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; and the examiner does not have any final authority to make an order. He develops the case and reports to the commission.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is it not true that there is no administrative or discretionary power delegated here? This is just fact-finding. Is not that all this bill does?

Mr. STAFFORD. It does more than that.

Mr. RAYBURN. There is discretion because they make a finding and when the finding is made it becomes the order of the commission unless complaint is filed or unless all parties agree to the finding of this employee. In such event it goes to the commission.

Mr. STAFFORD. With that explanation, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the interstate commerce act, as amended (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 17), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(6) The commission is hereby authorized by its order to assign or refer any portion or class of its work, business, or functions arising under this or any other act of Congress or referred to it by Congress, or either branch thereof, to an individual commissioner, or to a board composed of an employee or employees of the commission, to be designated by such order, for action thereon, and by its order at any time to amend, modify, supplement, or

rescind any such assignment or reference: *Provided, however,* That this authority shall not extend to investigations instituted upon the commission's own motion nor, without the consent of the parties thereto, to contested proceedings involving the taking of testimony at public hearings. All such orders shall take effect forthwith and remain in effect until otherwise ordered by the commission. In case of the absence or inability for any other reason to act of any such individual commissioner or employee designated to serve upon any such board, the chairman of the commission may designate another commissioner or employee, as the case may be, to serve temporarily until the commission shall otherwise order. In conformity with and subject to the order or orders of the commission in the premises, any such individual commissioner, or board acting by a majority thereof, shall have power and authority to hear and determine, order, certify, report, or otherwise act as to any of said work, business, or functions so assigned or referred to him or it for action by the commission and in respect thereof shall have all the jurisdiction and powers now or then conferred by law upon the commission and be subject to the same duties and obligations. Any order, decision, or report made or other action taken by any such individual commissioner or board in respect of any matters so assigned or referred shall have the same force and effect, and may be made, evidenced, and enforced in the same manner as if made or taken by the commission. Any party affected by any order, decision, or report of any such individual commissioner or board may file a petition for reconsideration or for rehearing by the commission or a division thereof and every such petition shall be passed upon by the commission or a division thereof. Any action by a division upon such a petition shall itself be subject to reconsideration by the commission, as provided in section 16a of this act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 16a), and in paragraph (4) of this section. The commission may, as provided in paragraph (1) of this section, make and amend rules for the conduct of proceedings before such individual commissioner or board and for the rehearing of such action before a division of the commission or the commission. The secretary and seal of the commission shall be the secretary and seal of such individual commissioner or board."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "or class."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

NAVY RATION

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to calendar No. 523, the bill (H. R. 14438) to effect needed changes in the Navy ration. A certain amendment has been agreed to that will correct the objection, and the bill will save the Government about \$75,000 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it was stated from the Speaker's rostrum on the last occasion of calling the calendar that it is a rather questionable practice to return to a bill after it has once been passed on the calendar.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. This will save the Government at least \$75,000, and we are just trying to cooperate in this way.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I made the original objection, and after having a consultation with those interested in the subject, we agreed to eliminate two sections and to make certain changes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Wait a minute before you talk about any agreement. Let us in on that agreement.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ALLOTMENTS OF DECEASED INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14059, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior in behalf of Indians to purchase the allotments of deceased Indians, and for other purposes.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that both the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Budget think that on account of the financial condition of the Treasury this bill should be postponed for future consideration, I object.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman reserve the objection?

Mr. PETTENGILL. I reserve it for an explanation.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has stated that his objection to the bill is on the basis of the state-

ment of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior. I can state to the gentleman on my own responsibility that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs consider this the most fundamental Indian bill that has been before us at this session of Congress.

The Assistant Commissioner was before the committee and expressed their judgment and has told me personally that the statement made in the last paragraph of the report is entirely due to the standing rule that they must report against expenditures of any kind at this time.

The reason this is the most fundamental piece of Indian legislation that has been before us this session is this: On nearly all of the reservations land has been pretty largely allotted, and proper provision has not been made for succeeding generations of Indian children who have come along. The Indians to whom the lands have been allotted in many cases have died with numerous heirs. The land is in a confused state of inheritance and there is no way, under ordinary conditions, to dispose of it for the benefit of the estate except to sell it. The Indian is hardly ever in a position to raise the money to buy it. The result is that it often goes into the hands of white people and the Indians are gradually, on many reservations, being deprived of these lands through the working out of the present law.

All this bill would do would be to authorize the setting up of a revolving fund upon which the Indians who live on the reservations and who must have one-quarter of Indian blood and who need to be enabled to live among their own people may draw and have from 5 to 20 years to pay back to the Government to buy this land instead of having it pass out of their hands. The Indians have no other means of credit.

Mr. PETTENGILL. I understand that ultimately it does not cost the Treasury anything.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is a revolving fund.

Mr. PETTENGILL. How is the Treasury secured?

Mr. LEAVITT. By the land itself. The Indian, as the gentleman knows, has no access to credit of any kind. He is a ward of the Government, and in order to enable him to buy land we set up this revolving fund. He thus becomes self-supporting and ceases to be a burden on the Government. That is the proposition, and having been connected with Indian affairs and given them a great deal of study for years, I consider this the most fundamental piece of Indian legislation that has been before Congress this year.

Mr. PETTENGILL. What will be the cost?

Mr. LEAVITT. The statement made in the report by the assistant commissioner is that for this fiscal year there would be no appropriation at all but only a study. Then for the next fiscal year not over \$100,000, and so this fund may be built up to say \$500,000. It would revolve and finally come back into the Treasury after a number of years.

Mr. PETTENGILL. What hardship would ensue if the bill is not passed now?

Mr. LEAVITT. The hardship would be that human beings die and this problem accumulates. If the bill is enacted now the incoming Indian administration can begin to study this question. That will take a year, and the next fiscal year the request would come in for an appropriation. Then it would be a small appropriation, but that would revolve and go into a fund.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman a question. This is going to cost eventually \$500,000.

Mr. LEAVITT. It is a revolving fund that would come back into the Treasury.

Mr. BLANTON. But eventually it will cost \$500,000.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I object. I want to save that \$500,000.

EXTENDING TEMPORARY RELIEF OF WATER USERS ON IRRIGATION PROJECTS ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The Clerk read the next bill on the calendar, H. R. 14432, a bill to extend temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects on Indian reservations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Congress has not heretofore taken action to defer action on the irrigation projects for the last half of 1932 and for the full year of 1933, and for the time being I ask unanimous consent that this go over without prejudice.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement is not quite accurate. Congress has passed legislation that defers these payments, not including the period that is in this bill, but making some deferment. But the Senate has passed a bill that covers it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think I am accurate when I said that the Congress has not yet taken any action toward the deferment of maintenance charges for the last half of 1932.

Mr. LEAVITT. No; the gentleman is not quite accurate. The Senate has passed such a resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the Congress has not passed it. I am fully aware of the fact that the resolution has passed the Senate and that a rule has been adopted for the consideration of the Chavez bill by the House, but I still insist that my statement was correct that Congress has not yet taken any action toward the deferment of the maintenance and construction charges for the last half of 1932 and for the year 1933.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There are many Americans just now who live in districts with water charges of \$20 an acre against them. It is eating them up. Why should we grant relief here, when you do not grant general relief to all the people affected in that way.

Mr. LEAVITT. This applies to every person on Indian reservations.

Mr. BLANTON. In particular water projects.

Mr. LEAVITT. No; to all of them that are on Indian reservations. If the gentleman's friends are on a Federal reclamation project—

Mr. BLANTON. Unfortunately they are not. If they were on a Federal project, these gentlemen from the West, who get so many hand-outs would be taking care of them along with the remainder of those Government-project people, but unfortunately they are in a private project where the money has to come out of their own pockets.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, for the time being I object.

EXCLUDING CERTAIN TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES FROM OPERATION OF THE ECONOMY ACT

The next business on the Consent Calendar was House Joint Resolution 547, to exclude certain temporary employees from the operation of the economy act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I have no disagreement with the bill where it provides that those who shovel snow shall be allowed the benefit of this provision, but is it not a fact that if you extend that same provision to those who handle the mail, you will have the strange situation of paying more to a temporary employee than to a regular one?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, they got 65 cents an hour for a few hours' time.

Mr. STAFFORD. But this employment was undertaken at a stated sum.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. This applies only to temporary Christmas help. There was nobody in my station in New York who knew that this deduction would be made at the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. But they undertook the employment at a certain schedule of pay.

Mr. McCORMACK. And did not get it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, they got it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no. These men are employed for two or three or four days and a week at the most. They are not the men who are on the temporary roll of the post office throughout the year, who are called in from day to day for

several hours or two hours work each day. These are additional help necessary as a result of the extraordinary increase in the mail at Christmas time.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not seeking to object to any schedule of pay for those who are to be employed for future holiday seasons, but I only seek to object to an increase of pay to those who have already rendered service under a certain schedule of pay.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I know the conditions in my city. I know that these men were employed and were engaged at a certain price per hour, and that the officials did not know or did not expect at the time that the deduction would be made. That is all there is to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The money was appropriated for the full amount. I am going to offer an amendment so that there will be no future appropriation. My amendment will strike out, on page 2, in lines 3 and 4, the language—

out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount—

and insert in lieu thereof—

out of the appropriation from which such employee was paid such reduced amount, a sum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, but it all comes out of the Treasury in the end. That is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. My position is this. I raise no question with reference to those who handle the snow, but does not this bill discriminate and provide that a man on temporary employment will be paid more than the man on regular employment, and thereby we will bring down upon us the condemnation of the man on regular employment, in whom I am very much interested.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unfortunately the man who is working on a per diem in a regular capacity and who during the year receives less than a thousand dollars suffers the 8½ per cent deduction.

His per diem pay, if he worked the entire year, would have been in excess of \$1,000. He received 8½ per cent reduction, whether or not he received during the entire year an amount in excess of \$1,000. That is true, but this only applies to a group of men who were called in at Christmas time to work 2 or 3 or 4 days.

Mr. JENKINS. Then we have this situation, have we, that unless this bill is passed we have the strange situation of men having been employed at a certain amount and having to give 8½ per cent of it back?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. I withdraw the reservation of objection. What I wanted to do was to clarify the matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to providing that the deduction shall not apply in the future, but as to those who were employed in the past, I think it is establishing a bad precedent, and therefore I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to my friend, I have the greatest respect for him, but this is one objection which, if the gentleman makes now, he will regret in future years. This is one deserving case.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, do not lecture me, because that does not do any good. If the gentleman has any facts, I will listen to him, but do not lecture me.

Mr. McCORMACK. No one is lecturing the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; the gentleman is lecturing me.

Mr. McCORMACK. They only worked three or four days.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am saying I do not object to having the deduction not apply in the future; but why should we go back now?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. There may be some justification for deducting it in the future if the wage is fixed; but these men were employed at a certain rate, and they did not receive that rate, and the officials who employed them were not

aware of the fact that the deduction had to be made. It is, in all fairness and justice, recommended by everybody from the Postmaster General down. No one expected to make this deduction.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. As it stands now, there are many people over this country who were given two or three or four days' work who will not get what they expected to get?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What they were engaged for and what they were supposed to be paid by the Postmaster General—

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The committee of which I am chairman considered this bill, and we learned that no man was allowed to work in the Postal Service at the Christmas holidays unless he could produce evidence showing that he had dependents. They went in there to work three or four days at a given wage, and just at the time they were to be paid off a telegram came from the Postmaster General saying that the comptroller said, "You must take 8½ per cent off." Just imagine such a thing! Deducting 8½ per cent of a man's money from the few dollars he was to get.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman who reported this bill is giving me information and not "blah" from the supposed friend of the Postal Service. I withdraw the reservation of objection, and I am not influenced by the lecture of the Irish advocate from Boston. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCORMACK. I accept the characterization as a compliment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions requiring reductions in compensation contained in Title I of Part II of the legislative appropriation act, fiscal year 1933, shall not apply to additional employees engaged for the purposes of removal of snow in the District of Columbia, and outside the District of Columbia when such removal is at the expense of the United States, or to additional employees of the Post Office Department engaged in handling Christmas mail. In the case of any such employee who, prior to the enactment of this act, has been paid a reduced amount by reason of the application to him of such provisions reducing compensation, there is hereby authorized to be paid to him, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to the difference between the amount actually paid to him and the amount he would have been paid for the same work if such provisions had not been applied to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McCORMACK: On page 2, in lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "out of the appropriation from which such employee was paid such reduced amount, a sum."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONNECTING LEE BOULEVARD WITH ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14078, authorizing the Secretary of War to deed certain properties to the State of Virginia in order to connect Lee Boulevard with the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a Senate bill be substituted, which is an identic bill with the bill under consideration, S. 5339.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 5339

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to provide a connection between the Lee Boulevard and the Arlington Memorial Bridge, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to convey to the county of

Arlington, State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a strip of land through the southerly portion of the Fort Myer Military Reservation necessary for the construction of a connection from the Lee Boulevard to the Arlington Memorial Bridge, consisting of a right of way not more than 100 feet in width, said deed of conveyance to contain a restriction against the construction of buildings, fences, or other structures within 110 feet of the center line of said right of way.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is hereby further authorized to convey to the said county of Arlington for highway purposes only, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a strip of land for a continuous right of way approximately 60 feet in width within and adjacent to the southerly boundary of the Arlington Reservation from the intersection of said reservation line with the northerly line of the right of way to be conveyed under section 1 to the east line of McKinley Street.

SEC. 3. The lands to be so conveyed are approximately as shown on plat numbered 104.2-166 in the files of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

SEC. 4. The deeds of conveyance shall contain a reservation reserving to the United States the right to resume possession and occupy said tracts of land, or any portion thereof, whenever in the judgment of the President an emergency exists that requires the use and appropriation of the same for the public defense, and also a further reservation that the title hereby conveyed shall revert to the United States and all rights hereby granted shall cease and be forfeited, unless the said county of Arlington shall construct the said highway and assume the obligations herein provided within three years from the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Upon the consummation of the conveyance herein authorized to the county of Arlington, State of Virginia, the jurisdiction of the United States over said lands, subject to the conditions and reservations in said deed provided, shall immediately cease and determine and revert in the State of Virginia.

SEC. 6. That if at any time the lands herein authorized to be conveyed to the said county of Arlington, State of Virginia, shall cease to be used for the purposes herein specified, the title in and jurisdiction over the same shall revert to the Government of the United States.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ERECTION OF ONE MARKER FOR CERTAIN CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11947, to authorize the Secretary of War to erect one marker for the graves of 85 Confederate soldiers, buried in the Old Rondo Cemetery in Miller County, Ark., in lieu of separate markers as now authorized by law.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to erect one single marker in Old Rondo Cemetery in Miller County, Ark., in which are buried 85 Confederate soldiers, some unknown, at a cost not exceeding the cost to be represented by 85 separate markers as now authorized by law.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "the cost to be represented by 85 separate markers as now authorized by law" and at the end of the bill insert "\$250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

NAVAL, MILITARY, AND COAST GUARD ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14282, to confer the degree of bachelor of science upon the graduates of the Naval, the Military, and the Coast Guard Academies.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think we do plenty for the boys at these academies. I object.

HEIRS OF DECEASED INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3508, to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this bill been amended as suggested?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has the full approval of the department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when any Indian to whom an allotment of land has been made, or may hereafter be made, dies before the expiration of the trust period and before the issuance of a fee-simple patent, without having made a will disposing of said allotment as hereinafter provided, the Secretary of the Interior, upon notice and hearing, under such rules as he may prescribe, shall ascertain the legal heirs of such decedent, and his decision thereon shall be final and conclusive. If the Secretary of the Interior decides the heir or heirs of such decedent competent to manage their own affairs, he shall issue to such heir or heirs a patent in fee for the allotment of such decedent; if he shall decide one or more of the heirs to be incompetent, he may, in his discretion, cause such lands to be sold: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Interior shall find that the lands of the decedent are capable of partition to the advantage of the heirs, he may cause the shares of such as are competent, upon their petition, to be set aside and patents in fee to be issued to them therefor. All sales of lands allotted to Indians authorized by this or any other act shall be made under such rules and regulations and upon such terms as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, and he shall require a deposit of 10 per cent of the purchase price at the time of the sale. Should the purchaser fail to comply with the terms of sale prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, the amount so paid shall be forfeited; in case the balance of the purchase price is to be paid on such deferred payments, all payments made, together with all interest paid on such deferred installments, shall be so forfeited for failure to comply with the terms of the sale. All forfeitures shall inure to the benefit of the heirs. Upon payment of the purchase price in full, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be issued to the purchaser patent in fee for such land: *Provided*, That the proceeds of the sale of inherited lands shall be paid to such heir or heirs as may be competent and held in trust subject to use and expenditure during the trust period for such heir or heirs as may be incompetent as their respective interests shall appear: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to issue a certificate of competency, upon application therefor, to any Indian, or, in case of his death, to his heirs, to whom a patent in fee containing restrictions on alienation has been or may hereafter be issued, and such certificate shall have the effect of removing the restrictions on alienation contained in such patent: *Provided further*, That hereafter any United States Indian agent, superintendent, or other disbursing agent of the Indian Service may deposit Indian moneys, individual or tribal, coming into his hands as custodian, in such bank or banks as he may select: *Provided*, That the bank or banks so selected by him shall first execute to the said disbursing agent a bond with approved surety in such amount as will properly safeguard the funds to be deposited. Such bonds shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "That" and insert in lieu thereof the word "That" preceded by a quotation mark.

Page 3, line 23, strike out the word "interior" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Interior" followed by a quotation mark.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

TEXAS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

The Clerk called the next House joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 596, authorizing the President, under certain conditions, to invite the participation of other nations in the Texas centennial celebration, providing for the admission of their exhibits, and for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will state the grounds for my objection. It has virtually been agreed in the House that we shall not undertake any expenditure in these pressing times for expositions and the like. This will involve a considerable expenditure by the National Government by the mere invitation of the President to the foreign governments to participate. The exposition is in 1936.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. This is in recognition of a Republic and not of a State. It is the centennial commemoration of the one hundredth birthday of a Republic.

Mr. LEAVITT. Does it cost any money?

Mr. BLANTON. Not a cent.

Mr. LEAVITT. I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] if it costs any money now, or will it cost the Government money at a later date.

Mr. BLANTON. It is going to cost the State of Texas money.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will it cost the Government of the United States money? I ask that the gentleman answer me as he insisted that I answer him.

Mr. BLANTON. This resolution does not cost the Government anything.

Mr. KLEBERG. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will inform the gentleman, for I happen to be the author of the resolution.

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes; because the gentleman's colleague does not know anything about it.

Mr. BLANTON. I told the gentleman it does not cost the Government anything.

Mr. KLEBERG. This resolution does not obligate the Government of the United States to any expenditure in connection with the Texas centennial, nor will it hereafter be obligated other than for suitable representation thereat.

Now, I may say to my colleague that it is important to the State of Texas that we gain the advantage of the passage of this resolution at the earliest possible opportunity. There are two reasons for this. The first reason is that the State of Texas happens to be the second largest exporting State in the Union. It follows New York. The earlier we get the publicity abroad attendant upon this resolution, the better will be the results in so far as our trade is concerned. The next reason is that we have a number of centennials, or a number of large shows and expositions, coming over the entire world. We are anxious to go on record to forestall any of these expositions falling in the way of this one.

Let me say to my colleague also that the State of Texas is celebrating, you might say, its birth, its real infusion with American blood, the date of its birth as a republic, which enabled it to come in 10 years later as one of the great fraternity of States.

The resolution carries a provision that until \$500,000 is raised by the State of Texas this proclamation shall not issue. It requires considerable time to raise that much money under present conditions. The legislature is now in session.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I notice the gentleman is flanked on one side by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom] and on the other side by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. This is a formidable combination. I do not see how the gentleman from Wisconsin can resist this combination.

Mr. STAFFORD. If conditions improve, as we hope they will, there will be no question of having a centennial to commemorate this event, but for the time being I shall object.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. We must consider these bills on the calendar.

Mr. KLEBERG. I am merely asking the gentleman to kindly withhold his objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withhold it for a minute, but we have some 30 bills yet to consider.

Mr. KLEBERG. But this is a very important matter to the State of Texas.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know. I have set forth my reasons for objecting.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman withhold his objection to permit me to make one further statement?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. KLEBERG. It seems to me there is no necessity for the exhibition of any fears at the present time that it will cost the Government anything. The Congress certainly has the intestinal fortitude to say "no" if that last recourse becomes necessary. But there are two considerations: First, \$500,000 must be raised before the proclamation can be

issued, and then the centennial is not to be held until 1936. I am sure the gentleman would not object for the sole purpose of preventing a petition for a laudable purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT BOCA CHICA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14411, to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Boca Chica, Tex.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are a number of bridge bills on the calendar to-day. This bill is not objected to by the department. Some of the bills on the calendar to-day are for municipalities to construct bridges. Other bills provide for corporations made up of citizens to construct the bridges. The Members say that the request for the extension of time is due to negotiations that they are having at the present time with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with a view to getting some money to take care of what they call self-liquidating projects. I am not going to prevent anybody from getting a job if he can, and having faith in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation not to lend money for the construction of any bridge until after a thorough investigation is made, I am not going to object to the bills. In one instance the money, over \$600,000, has been advanced by the corporation. It will mean work for the unemployed, and further means no bonds will be sold to the public. Unless the Reconstruction Finance Corporation finds the projects will be self-liquidating no bridges will be constructed. Of that I am sure.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, I will, so it is all right.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved June 10, 1932, to be built by the Boca Chica Bridge Co., across the Rio Grande at Boca Chica, Tex., are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from June 10, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Amend the title.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Boca Chica, Tex."

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER NEAR BATON ROUGE, LA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14460, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La., authorized to be built by the Louisiana Highway Commission, and the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., and the Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., by an act of Congress approved February 10, 1932, are hereby extended two and four years, respectively, from February 10, 1932.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "1932" and insert "1933."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE LITTLE RIVER, NEAR MORRIS FERRY, ARK.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14480, to extend the times for commencing and completing the reconstruction of a railroad bridge across the Little River at or near Morris Ferry, Ark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the reconstruction of a railroad bridge across the Little River at or near Morris Ferry, Ark., authorized to be reconstructed, maintained, and operated by the Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway Co., its successors, and assigns, by an act of Congress approved June 23, 1930, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from June 23, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER NEAR KANSAS CITY, KANS.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14500, to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans., authorized to be built by the Interstate Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved May 22, 1928, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved March 2, 1929, and June 30, 1930, is hereby further extended two years from May 22, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS ELK RIVER BETWEEN LAUDERDALE AND LIMESTONE COUNTIES, ALA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14602, to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Elk River between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, Ala.," approved February 16, 1928.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved February 16, 1928, granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Elk River, at a point suitable to the interest of navigation on the Athens-Florence Road between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, in the State of Alabama, be, and the same is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PACKING OLEOMARGARINE AND ADULTERATED BUTTER IN TINS

The Clerk read the next bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 4065, authorizing the packing of oleomargarine and adulterated butter in tin and other suitable packages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKHEAD). Is there objection?

Mr. BOYLAN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire about this bill. There does not seem to be any statement here that the contents will not poison the poor unfortunate who has to eat this adulterated butter.

Mr. PURNELL. Let me say that this is approved by the Agricultural Department, the Treasury Department, the dairy interests, and everybody else. The fact is, that the industry was not acquainted in 1886 when the act was passed with the use of tin. They were not acquainted with the modern method of packing food, and so it was not included in the bill.

Mr. BOYLAN. Reading the report of the Department of Agriculture, it says that there appears to be no objection. It does not say that there is no objection. The report seems to be very weak. The Treasury Department says that the department can see no objection to the enactment when considered from the standpoint of revenue.

Mr. SEGER. If my friend, the gentleman from New York, will read the hearings on the bill, he will see that our colleague from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], one of the largest cattle raisers in the country and a member of the Committee on Agriculture, said:

I see no reason to object to this bill. The packing of food products has reached such an advanced stage that certain commodities carrying a high oxygen content are now packed in tin, foods which a few years ago it was believed could not be packed in such manner. For instance, they are now packing chickens and meats with fat content in tins, and there is no question at all in the product as to whether the tin would have a deleterious effect. As a matter of fact it is believed greater cleanliness and sanitation can be obtained by this process.

Mr. PURNELL. That is a fact and it is in the interest of public health.

Mr. SEGER. Let me say further, in the olden days no one really knew what oxygen did to food, but in the last few years research has disclosed the advantage of excluding as much oxygen as possible from many kinds of foods, thereby improving their quality and wholesomeness. The high vacuum process under which this oleomargarine and butter would be packed would prevent contamination.

Mr. BOYLAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, relying on the knowledge of the expert farmer from New Jersey, I will withdraw my reservation of an objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended (U. S. C., title 26, secs. 543, 544), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. That all oleomargarine shall be packed by the manufacturer thereof in firkins, tubs, or other wooden, tin-plate, or paper packages, not before used for that purpose, containing, or encased in a manufacturer's package made from any of such materials of, not less than 10 pounds and marked, stamped, and branded as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe; and all sales made by manufacturers of oleomargarine and wholesale dealers in oleomargarine shall be in original stamped packages. Retail dealers in oleomargarine must sell only from original stamped packages, in quantities not exceeding 10 pounds, and shall pack, or cause to be packed, the oleomargarine sold by them in suitable wooden, tin-plate, or paper packages which shall be marked and branded as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe. Every person who knowingly sells or offers for sale, or delivers or offers to deliver, any oleomargarine in any other form than in new wooden, tin-plate, or paper packages as above described, or who packs in any packages any oleomargarine in any manner contrary to law, or who falsely brands any package or affixes a stamp on any package denoting a less amount of tax than that required by law shall be fined for each offense not more than \$1,000, and be imprisoned not more than two years."

Sec. 2. (a) The eighth paragraph of section 4 of the act of May 9, 1902 (32 Stat. 193, ch. 784), is amended to read as follows:

"That all adulterated butter shall be packed by the manufacturer thereof in firkins, tubs, or other wooden, tin-plate, or paper packages not before used for that purpose, containing, or encased in a manufacturer's package made from any of such materials of, not less than 10 pounds, and marked, stamped, and branded as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, and all sales made by manufacturers of adulterated butter shall be in original, stamped packages."

(b) The ninth paragraph of such section 4 is amended by adding after the word "wooden" wherever it appears in such paragraph a comma and the word "tin-plate."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

CONGRESS AND THE FARM-MORTGAGE PROBLEM

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there is no more important subject upon which legislation should be enacted in the closing days of this session than that dealing with both emergency and a long-time program of relief from farm and small-home mortgage indebtedness. Upon invitation of the National Grange I delivered an address over the radio upon this subject on Saturday last, and I request unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing this address in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by myself Saturday, February 18, 1933:

Good friends of the radio audience, the generous reference of Mr. Brenckman to my membership and official connection with the Grange and to my years of service in the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Agriculture is much appreciated, and in return I am happy to acknowledge the constant and constructive assistance of the National Grange and associating farm organizations in the advancement of farm legislation.

In passing it may be of interest to note that during my 12 years' service in the House there have been 73 roll calls upon farm legislation. My record shows 68 favorable and no adverse votes. To these I hope to add one more in support of emergency relief to farm and home owners burdened with mortgage indebtedness.

In this time so generously assigned me by the National Grange I shall do my best to bring an informative and hopeful message upon the subject "Congress and the Farm Mortgage Problem."

At the outset I hasten to assure every listener that Congress is fully appreciative of the crisis rapidly developing in Agriculture caused by the slump in farm prices and the consequent inability of farmers to meet interest charges and payments upon their mortgages and to pay their taxes. Scores of bills have been introduced proposing both emergency and long-time relief. The few remaining days of the present session of Congress will only be sufficient to consider emergency legislation and in consequence this discussion will be limited to that phase of the subject.

Illustration of this emergency legislation is H. R. 14504, introduced by myself. This bill provided emergency relief for borrowers from joint-stock land banks through loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to such banks, upon condition that the annual interest rate to borrowers should be reduced from 6 per cent to 4 per cent and that a moratorium should be granted to such borrowers as might desire. In modified form this bill has been incorporated in Senate 5639, known as the Hull bill which was favorably reported to the Senate this week. It is earnestly hoped that favorable consideration may be given this vitally important measure before the close of the session.

Specifically the Hull bill authorizes and directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to owners of mortgages on farms, and on homes not exceeding \$8,000 in value. These loans are made to enable such mortgage owners to take care of defaults in payments of interest, principal and unpaid taxes, and upon the further condition that no foreclosure proceedings shall be started for two years, and that the borrower shall not be charged in excess of 4 per cent interest on the advances made.

Owing to the fact that both Federal and joint-stock land banks were set up by act of Congress to care for the farm-mortgage situation, the Hull bill naturally makes special provision to enable these agencies to function in the present emergency. One hundred million dollars is definitely allocated to these banks under the conditions outlined in my bill to which reference has already been made.

The Federal and joint-stock land banks carry about 19 per cent of the total farm mortgages of the country; 81 per cent of such mortgages are therefore held by other agencies, including insurance companies with 23 per cent, commercial banks holding 11 per cent, active and retired farmers 14 per cent, and all other agencies and individuals 23 per cent. Relief is likewise provided for borrowers from these sources through the provisions of the Hull bill, making advances and loans to the holders of such mortgages under such terms and conditions as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may prescribe.

At this point it will be well to emphasize the fact that the Hull bill provides relief to owners of homes in villages and cities where the value does not exceed \$8,000. The conditions under which such relief can be given will be worked out by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but are expected to follow as closely as possible the specific regulations set up for the handling of loans to the Federal land banks.

For the benefit of those who do not fully appreciate the critical farm-debt situation it is only necessary to recall the demonstrations of protest attending farm-mortgage sales in many sections of the country. In some instances these demonstrations have doubtless been inspired by arbitrary action on the part of bank receivers and in some cases by unscrupulous persons who have taken advantage of the present situation to acquire mortgages at liberal discounts and have proceeded to foreclosure.

It is positively startling to learn that 42 per cent of all the farms of the United States are mortgaged and that the total of such indebtedness runs to approximately nine and a quarter billion dollars. Other forms of farm indebtedness total approximately \$3,000,000,000, making a grand total of \$12,000,000,000 of farm debt. Nearly 60 per cent of farm mortgage indebtedness of the country is upon farms located in the 12 North Central States, commonly called the "bread basket" of the country. The total annual interest charge on this mortgage indebtedness at the average rate of 5.8 per cent amounts to \$536,000,000. When this staggering amount is added to another \$500,000,000 and more of local and State taxation on farms, we get a much clearer understanding of the tragic farm economic situation.

Keeping in mind this gigantic outlay of over a billion dollars for mortgage interest and farm taxation alone, we should also remember the like tragic reduction of the farmers' income due to a slump in farm commodity prices. The total value of farm

crops for 1932 is estimated at \$5,500,000,000 in contrast with \$12,000,000,000 average value during ordinary times. When more than 20 per cent of the total value of all farm products is absorbed by interest and taxes, it is no wonder that demonstrations of protest against mortgage foreclosures have become commonplace. By way of additional emphasis upon the difficulties of the situation it is noted that it would require more than the total hog production of the country, or two and one-half times the total wheat crop for 1932, to pay the farm-mortgage interest charge alone.

If we considered the percentage of these two crops produced upon mortgaged farms only, it would require two and one-third times their hog production and 5.8 times their 1932 wheat crop to balance this interest account.

If the State of Michigan is taken as an illustration of the average farm-mortgage situation in the North Central group of States, it is found that 82,000 of the total of 169,000 farms of the State are mortgaged. The total amount of the State's mortgage indebtedness is \$230,000,000, and the annual interest charge thereon is \$14,500,000. The extreme in mortgage indebtedness is in Iowa, where the total farm mortgage debt is \$1,100,000,000 and the annual interest charge nearly \$61,000,000. These comparisons must convince every thoughtful person that there is a real emergency confronting the country in this matter of readjusting the burden of farm mortgage indebtedness.

As I see it, farm prices must be lifted and the burden of interest and taxes reduced if we are to avoid an utter collapse of agriculture. In my opinion, there is no more important question than this immediately confronting the Congress. In a larger sense it is a national problem rather than a farm problem, because it is generally admitted that agriculture is fundamentally important to any permanent prosperity which the country may expect. Hon. L. J. Tabor, master of the National Grange, in a recent statement before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, hit the nail squarely on the head when he said:

"There is a better way to stop foreclosures and protect the interest of farmers than gathering at sheriff's sales in massed groups on the courthouse steps. There is a better way than intimidation, and this better way consists in the enactment of such legislation as is proposed in the bills now pending before this committee."

Emergency legislation is absolutely essential before March 4, and a long-time program is equally vital during the special session soon to be held. The National Grange and associated farm organizations deserve the commendation of every friend of agriculture for the constructive leadership they have shown in this crisis, and now that Senate bill 5639, embodying the essentials of an emergency program, is ready for consideration, every listener who believes that such a program is vitally essential should rally to their support in an effort to secure its speedy enactment into law.

LOANS FROM THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD

The Clerk read the next bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 10824, a bill to aid farmers in obtaining loans from the Federal Farm Loan Board or other governmental agencies.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of aiding the farmers in the county of Osage, State of Oklahoma, to obtain loans on farms and ranches owned by them in said county and State, in accordance with the intention of Congress as heretofore expressed in the laws providing for the granting of loans to farmers throughout the United States, and in conformity with the regulations promulgated thereunder, it is hereby directed that the Federal Farm Loan Board and other governmental agencies authorized to make these loans shall grant to the owners of lands in said Osage County, State of Oklahoma, the right and privilege to obtain these loans in the same manner and in accordance with the regulations now in effect without regard to the interest the said owners may have in the mineral rights which are vested in the Osage Tribe of Indians.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend section 14, subdivision 3, of the Federal Farm Loan act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI, BATON ROUGE, LA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14378) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I shall be glad to withhold my objection, but I shall state in this connection in respect to all of these toll-bridge bills that I am following the recom-

mendation of the Bureau of Roads in the Department of Agriculture. There is nothing personal concerning the matter in respect to any one bill.

Mr. MILLIGAN. As I understand it, the Agriculture Department and the War Department have both approved this bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then I am in error. But I find here on page 2 of the report:

The department, therefore, recommends against favorable action on the bill proposing to further extend the times for commencing and completing the bridge authorized to be constructed by the Baton Rouge-Mississippi River Bridge Co.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill has been before the Congress after its passage for several years, and it has met with the approval of the Member from New York. The bridging of the Mississippi River is no easy job. It involves an expenditure of possibly \$7,000,000 for a combined highway and railway bridge at this point. This bridge, of necessity, must be a combination railroad and highway bridge. It can not be built by the railroads because there is not sufficient railroad traffic there to justify the cost, and it can not be built by the highway department for the same reason. There is a combination, and there will have to be a combination. The whole State of Louisiana is interested in this proposition. The difficulty in crossing the Mississippi River by automobile in low water is very great and very dangerous, and the necessity for a bridge at Baton Rouge is very great. There is a widespread interest in this.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I read further from the report of the Department of Agriculture:

Since the Baton Rouge-Mississippi River Bridge Co. already has been granted two extensions of time for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge under their authorization, and as it appears that any bridge constructed at this point would have to be a combination highway and railroad bridge, it is believed that instead of extending the time as proposed in this bill the authority proposed in H. R. 14377 to the Louisiana Highway Commission and the railroad companies therein named should be granted. One reason for making this suggestion is that if the proposed authority for the Louisiana Highway Commission and the railroad companies that would cooperate with it should not be granted and the extension of time proposed should be granted, then it might be that the holders of the extended authorization would exact compensation from the State and the railroad companies for permitting them to proceed thereunder.

It seems to me that that is irresistible.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, all of the benefits under this franchise in the name of the Baton Rouge-Mississippi Bridge Co. have been transferred to the Louisiana Highway Commission and to the railroads mentioned in the other bill. The company whose name appears in this bill has no interest in the world in it. It is a body of patriotic citizens there who desire to secure a bridge.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Where is H. R. 14377?

Mr. KEMP. That has already passed the House.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then that is all the gentleman needs.

Mr. KEMP. There may be great difficulty in issuing bonds and providing the necessary finances to build this bridge in the combined name of the Louisiana Highway Commission and the joint railroads.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Not at all. If the project is at all feasible, under section 202 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation law, they can get the money.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have to proceed. If the gentleman from New York has made up his mind that he is going to object, I think he should say so.

Mr. KEMP. I hope the gentleman will not press his objection.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS OHIO RIVER, SISTERSVILLE, W. VA.

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14462) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Sistersville, Tyler County, W. Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, just one moment. My notation is that ultimately this is to be a free bridge, operated by the West Virginia State Road Commission, and for that reason I thought the general objection might be removed.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I read from page 3 of the report from the Department of Agriculture:

When the original bill to authorize the construction of this bridge across the Ohio River by the Sistersville Ohio River Bridge Co. was pending, this department submitted to your committee and to the Senate Committee on Commerce adverse reports thereon. It still is the view of the department that a private toll bridge should not be built at this place.

I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. I also read from the report on page 2:

Upon completion of construction the Sistersville Ohio River Bridge Co. will deliver title to the city of Sistersville, W. Va., and/or the West Virginia State Road Commission with the understanding that upon retirement of the costs of the construction of the project the bridge shall be maintained as a free bridge.

That is in the original bill. Ultimately it is to be a free bridge.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, they have had their opportunity. I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS POTOMAC RIVER AT DAHLGREN, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14303, authorizing the George Washington-Wakefield Memorial Bridge Corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS ALLEGHENY RIVER, PITTSBURGH-SHARPSBURG, PA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14584, granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Allegheny River between the city of Pittsburgh and the township of O'Hara and the borough of Sharpsburg, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Allegheny River at a point suitable to the interest of navigation, between the city of Pittsburgh and the township of O'Hara and the borough of Sharpsburg, to replace No. 9 Allegheny River Bridge, commonly known as the Highland Park Bridge, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the word "toll."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain,

and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River between the city of Pittsburgh and the township of O'Hara and the borough of Sharpsburg, Pa."

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, NEAR CULBERTSON, MONT.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14586, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Culbertson, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Culbertson, Mont., authorized to be built by the State of Montana and the counties of Roosevelt and Richland, or any of them, by the act of Congress approved July 3, 1930, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved February 20, 1931, and February 10, 1932, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from July 3, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT TENTH STREET, BETTENDORF, IOWA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14589, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Tenth Street in Bettendorf, Iowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Tenth Street in Bettendorf, Iowa, authorized to be built by B. F. Peek, G. A. Shallberg, and C. I. Josephson, of Moline, Ill.; J. W. Bettendorf, A. J. Russell, and J. L. Hecht, of Bettendorf and Davenport, Iowa, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by an act of Congress approved May 26, 1928, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved March 2, 1929, June 10, 1930, and April 22, 1932, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from April 22, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, in line 4, strike out "April 22," and insert "May 26."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN NEW ORLEANS AND GRENA, LA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14601, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Gretna, La.

There being no objection the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between New Orleans and Gretna, La., authorized to be built by George A. Hero and Allen S. Hackett, their successors and assigns, by act of Congress approved March 2, 1927, heretofore extended by act of Congress approved March 6, 1928, and also by act of Congress approved February 19, 1929, and also by act of Congress approved March 6, 1930, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from March 6, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "Act" and insert the word "acts"; page 1, line 9, strike out the words "and also by act of Congress approved"; page 2, line 1, strike out the words "also by act of Congress approved March 6," and insert "June 10", and on page 2, line 2, after the word "hereby" insert the word "further." Page 2, line 3, after the word "March" strike out the numeral "6" and insert the numeral "2."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE NEAR CEDAR POINT AND DAUPHIN ISLAND, ALA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14657, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of

a railroad bridge and/or a toll bridge across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a railroad bridge and/or a toll bridge across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala., authorized to be built by the Dauphin Island Railway & Harbor Co., its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved February 25, 1927, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved February 7, 1930, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from February 25, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER NEAR FARNAM STREET, OMAHA, NEBR.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 5370, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr., authorized to be built by the Omaha-Council Bluffs Missouri River Bridge board of trustees by an act of Congress approved June 10, 1930, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved February 20, 1931, and June 9, 1932, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from June 10, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE NEAR RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 5445, to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SALE OF SURPLUS COAL FOR DISTRIBUTION TO THE NEEDY

The Clerk called the next resolution, House Joint Resolution 526, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to sell surplus coal at nominal prices for distribution to the needy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve the objection.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman mind stating the ground of his objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. The report shows that ultimately the Secretary of the Navy would have to replace these stores. I object for the further reason that I do not think any community should be singled out for preferential consideration.

Mr. LEA. This applies to the whole Pacific coast.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the reason against giving special consideration to some locality.

Mr. LEA. None of this coal is needed for reserve at San Francisco. In addition, this coal has greatly deteriorated. It is a mass of powdered coal at the present time. It has been stored there for almost 10 years. It is of no substantial value for ship purposes. It is greatly needed for relief purposes, and I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have not passed any law granting special relief to a particular locality. This bill grants special relief to a particular locality.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

ESSEX SHORE WAY (INC.)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14537, authorizing Essex Shore Way (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to con-

struct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Merrimack River at or near Plum Island Point, Mass.

Mr. LaGUARDIA and Mr. MILLIGAN rose.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice. There is no report on it from the Roads Bureau.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the request I was going to make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CANYON DE CHELLY NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 13960, to amend the description of land described in section 1 of the act approved February 14, 1931, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to establish the Canyon De Chelly National Monument within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the description of the tract of land described in section 1 of the act approved February 14, 1931, entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to establish the Canyon De Chelly National Monument within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz." (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 445, 445b), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"All lands in Del Muerto, De Chelly, and Monument Canyons, and the canyons tributary thereto, and the lands within one-half mile of the rims of the said canyons, situated in unsurveyed townships 4 and 5 north, range 7 west; townships 4, 5, and 6 north, range 8 west; townships 4 and 5 north, range 9 west; and in surveyed townships 4 and 5 north, range 6 west; townships 3, 6, and 7 north, range 7 west; township 6 north, range 9 west; and township 5 north, range 10 west; embracing about 83,840 acres, all of the Navajo meridian, in Arizona."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RETAIL LIQUOR DEALERS' STAMP TAX

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 12843, to change the name of the retail liquor dealers' stamp tax in the case of retail drug stores or pharmacies.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER, LINCOLNTON, GA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14665, authorizing the State of Georgia to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Savannah River at or near Lincolnton, Ga.

Mr. MILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 5659 be considered in lieu of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the State of Georgia be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Savannah River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Lincolnton, Ga., and between Lincolnton, Ga., and McCormick, S. C., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the State of Georgia all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

Sec. 3. The said State of Georgia is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

Sec. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE, RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to House Calendar No. 560.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in explanation let me say this is an international bridge. The committee refers all these matters to the Department of Agriculture, but I do not think the Department of Agriculture should have considered this one because this is an international bridge. This is the reason I ask that we return to it, that we may take it up and pass it. It is a Senate bill and has passed the Senate.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by an act of Congress approved February 15, 1929, to be built by the Rio Grande City-Camargo Bridge Co., across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved January 31, 1931, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from February 15, 1933.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Amend the title.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex."

PRESCRIBING OF MEDICINAL LIQUORS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14395, relating to the prescribing of medicinal liquors.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. A rule has been given by the Rules Committee for the consideration of this bill and we may be able to save time by taking it up now.

Mr. JENKINS. Let it come up under the rule. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ALTERNATE BUDGET FOR THE INDIAN SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14648, providing for an alternate budget for the Indian Service, fiscal year 1935.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman reserve his objection? I am handling this bill for the Indian Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKHEAD). If the gentleman will allow the Chair to make a brief statement,

it is the desire of all concerned to finish the calling of the calendar this afternoon. I think it would expedite matters if gentlemen who intend ultimately to object to consideration of the bill would do so without granting undue opportunity for discussion.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been following religiously the adjuration of the Chair. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CONNERY. The chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs is here.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would prefer to hear from the "Indian" from Boston than the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CONNERY. As the gentleman will see from reading the report, we had a representative of the Indian Affairs Bureau before the committee on this matter. This is asked by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and it simply allows them to change their method of reporting to the Budget; and, in fact, gives them more work, but clarifies the different appropriations which are asked for.

Mr. STAFFORD. The report shows that this is going to mean additional expense on the Treasury and for the time being I object.

Mr. LEAVITT. Why does the gentleman say that?

Mr. STAFFORD. Because that is shown by the report.

I object, Mr. Speaker.

PRACTICE IN CRIMINAL CASES AFTER VERDICT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 4020, to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to prescribe rules of practice and procedure with respect to proceedings in criminal cases after verdict.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of practice and procedure with respect to any or all proceedings after verdict in criminal cases in district courts of the United States, including the district courts of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Canal Zone, and Virgin Islands, in the Supreme Courts of the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in the United States Court for China, in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 2. The right of appeal shall continue in those cases in which appeals are now authorized by law, but the rules made as herein authorized may prescribe the times for and manner of taking appeals and of preparing records and bills of exceptions and the conditions on which supersedeas or bail may be allowed.

Sec. 3. The Supreme Court may fix the dates when such rules shall take effect and the extent to which they shall apply to proceedings then pending and after they become effective all laws in conflict therewith shall be of no further force.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed; and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

UNITED STATES ROANOKE COLONY COMMISSION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14412, to enable the United States Roanoke Colony Commission to carry out and give effect to certain plans for the comprehensive observance of the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of English-speaking civilization in America.

Mr. JENKINS and Mr. BLANTON objected.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 11991, to authorize the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury to turn over to State agencies, for use in the enforcement of laws for the protection of migratory birds, forfeited vessels acquired by the Department of Justice and Treasury Department and no longer needed for official use.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

IMPORTATION OF MILK AND CREAM AND MILK AND CREAM PRODUCTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 14569, to regulate the importation of milk and cream and milk and cream products into the United States for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry of the United States and protecting the public health.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

POWER SITES ON THE BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 277, defining and regulating power sites upon the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana.

Mr. PETTENGILL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HIGH-SCHOOL BUILDING, SHANNON COUNTY, S. DAK.

The Clerk called the next bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 2340, to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of Shannon County, S. Dak., in the construction of a consolidated high-school building to be available to both white and Indian children.

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On February 7, 1933:

H. R. 13959. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Fairbanks, Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$100,000 for the purpose of constructing and equipping a public-school building in the town of Fairbanks, Alaska, and for other purposes.

On February 8, 1933:

H. R. 13607. An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress.

On February 11, 1933:

H. J. Res. 597. Joint resolution to provide appropriations to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved February 8, 1933; and

H. R. 14228. An act to change the name of Roosevelt Island to Theodore Roosevelt Island.

On February 13, 1933:

H. J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1933.

On February 14, 1933:

H. R. 698. An act authorizing the President to transfer and appoint Lieut. (junior grade) Arnold R. Kline, United States Navy, to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps, United States Navy;

H. R. 1225. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Campus Martius Memorial Museum, of the city of Marietta, Ohio, the silver service presented to the United States for the gunboat *Marietta*;

H. R. 6637. An act authorizing the President to present a medal of honor to Richmond Pearson Hobson; and

H. R. 7385. An act for the relief of Sidney Joseph Kent;

H. R. 5329. An act to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," as amended by the act of March 2, 1929;

H. R. 6733. An act for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska;

H. R. 9385. An act authorizing Roy H. Campbell, Charles H. Brown, G. H. Wilsey, and Dr. H. O. Strosnider, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.;

H. R. 13372. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Pee Dee River and a bridge across the Waccamaw River, both at or near Georgetown, S. C.;

H. R. 13535. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.;

H. R. 13743. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal near Tiskilwa, Ill.;

H. R. 13744. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Illinois and Mississippi Canal near Langley, Ill.;

H. R. 13852. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Rock River, south of Moline, Ill.;

H. R. 13974. An act granting the consent of Congress to Conner County, State of Idaho, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pend Oreille Lake at the city of Sandpoint, in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 14060. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 14129. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across that portion of Lake Michigan lying opposite the entrance to Chicago River, Ill., and a bridge across the Michigan Canal, otherwise known as the Ogden Slip, in the city of Chicago, Ill.; and

H. R. 14200. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.

On February 15, 1933:

H. R. 311. An act to approve Act No. 268 of the session laws of 1931 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the island of Molokai";

H. R. 12329. An act to establish the boundary lines of the Chippewa Indian territory in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 11930. An act to provide a preliminary examination of the Green River, Wash., with a view to the control of its floods;

H. R. 2065. An act for the relief of the Great Western Coal Mines Co.;

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Ida E. Godfrey and others;

H. R. 5786. An act for the relief of Essie Finger;

H. R. 9636. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to permit railroad and electric-car companies to provide mail transportation by motor vehicle in lieu of service by train;

H. R. 9714. An act for the relief of Marion F. Blackwell;

H. R. 11461. An act for the relief of C. N. Hildreth, jr.; and

H. R. 13523. An act in reference to land in the Bonnet Carre floodway area.

On February 16, 1933:

H. R. 7503. An act to repeal the Executive order of November 23, 1909, making the enticing of laborers from the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad a misdemeanor;

H. R. 7506. An act to repeal an ordinance enacted by the Isthmian Canal Commission August 5, 1911, and approved by the Secretary of War August 22, 1911, establishing market regulations for the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7508. An act to provide for the inspection of vessels navigating Canal Zone waters;

H. R. 7514. An act in relation to the Canal Zone postal service;

H. R. 7515. An act to provide for the establishment of a customs service in the Canal Zone, and other matters;

H. R. 7523. An act to amend sections 7, 8, and 9 of the Panama Canal act, as amended;

H. R. 7518. An act to amend an act entitled "An act extending certain privileges of canal employees to other officials on the Canal Zone and authorizing the President to make rules and regulations affecting health, sanitation, quarantine, taxation, public roads, self-propelled vehicles, and police powers on the Canal Zone, and for other purposes, including provision as to certain fees, money orders, and interest deposits," approved August 21, 1916;

H. R. 9166. An act for the relief of William E. B. Grant; and

H. R. 13770. An act to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. L. 484). On February 17, 1933:

H. R. 13710. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes.

TURNING OVER TO THE INDIAN SERVICE VEHICLES, VESSELS, ETC., SEIZED AND FORFEITED

The Clerk read the next bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 3654, an act to authorize turning over to the Indian Service vehicles, vessels, and supplies seized and forfeited for violation of liquor laws.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

TURNING OVER AMOUNTS DUE INDIANS TO SUPERINTENDENT OF INDIAN SERVICE

The Clerk read the next bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 4756, to authorize the Veterans' Administration or other Federal agencies to turn over to superintendents of the Indian Service amounts due Indians who are under legal disability or to estates of such deceased Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any money accruing from the Veterans' Administration or other governmental agency to incompetent adult Indians, or minor Indians, who are recognized wards of the Federal Government, for whom no legal guardians or other fiduciaries have been appointed may be paid, in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or other head of a governmental bureau or agency, having such funds for payment, to such superintendent or other bonded officer of the Indian Service as the Secretary of the Interior shall designate, for the use of such beneficiaries, or to be paid to or used for, the heirs of such deceased beneficiaries, to be handled and accounted for by him with other moneys under his control, in accordance with existing law and the regulations of the Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 1, RICHARDSON COUNTY, NEBR.

The Clerk read the next bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 4589, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment of part of the expenses incurred in securing improvements in drainage projects of drainage district No. 1, Richardson County, Nebr., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the Indians of the Sac and Fox Reservation, Nebr., whose lands shall be benefited by the project of drainage district No. 1, Richardson County, Nebr., is hereby authorized to pay, from funds now or hereafter on deposit to the credit of the individuals concerned, such Indians' pro rata share of the expenses incurred by landowners interested in such project in the prosecution of a suit in equity to require the said drainage district to enlarge the channel of its system, and to do all things necessary to accommodate the water accumulated therein and to prevent overflows thereof: *Provided*, That the amounts so paid on behalf of such Indians shall not exceed the rate of \$2 per acre for each acre of Indian land benefited nor a total of \$600.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS

The Clerk called the next business on the Consent Calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 237, authorizing the erection in the Department of State Building of a memorial to the American diplomatic and consular officers who while on active duty lost their lives under heroic or tragic circumstances.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant permission to the American Foreign Service Association for the erection of a memorial to the American diplomatic and consular officers who while on active duty lost their lives under

heroic or tragic circumstances. The design of the memorial shall be approved and the site in the Department of State Building shall be chosen by the Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of the said memorial.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TITLE TO SITE FOR PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECT, SUBJECT TO MINERAL RIGHTS

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 5588), authorizing the acceptance of title to sites for public building projects subject to the reservation of ore and mineral rights.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to sites and additional land for the construction thereof of public building projects authorized by the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 and subsequent acts, may be acquired subject to the reservation of title in and the right to mine ores and minerals on such sites and lands.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONTROL OF WASHINGTON CITY POST OFFICE

The next business on the Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 14461) to provide for placing the jurisdiction, custody, and control of the Washington City post office in the Secretary of the Treasury.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 1, 1898 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 285), is hereby amended to give the Secretary of the Treasury exclusive jurisdiction, control, and custody of the Washington City post office and the additions thereto, located at North Capitol Street and Massachusetts Avenue, to be operated and maintained by him the same as other public buildings under his custody and control.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

There are certain measures looking to the promotion of economic recovery which have been under consideration by the Congress and are so advanced toward completion or understanding as to seem possible of enactment during the present session.

1. It is most necessary that the principles of the bankruptcy bill which has already been acted upon by the House should be passed by the Senate. The whole object of the bill is to secure orderly cooperation between creditors and debtors, whether farmers, individuals, general corporations, or railroads, for mutual adjustment which will preserve the integrity and continuous operation of business, save the values of good will and the continuation of people in their occupations, and thus avoid destruction of the interest of both parties. This legislation is of the most critical importance in this period of readjustment. Incidentally, such a workable system is highly necessary in order to permit a certain minority of railroads to be so reorganized as to reduce fixed charges and thus relieve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of drains in prevention of destructive receiverships.

2. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway treaty should be ratified. It not only will serve a great national purpose but is of importance now also to relieve unemployment by its construction.

3. The enactment by the House of the general principles embodied in the Glass banking bill which has already

passed the Senate will greatly contribute to reestablish confidence. It is the first constructive step to remedy the prime weakness of our whole economic life—that is, organization of our credit system.

4. Authority should be given to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to increase the amount of loans to States and municipalities for purposes of assistance to distress on the same terms as the present act. While the corporation has funds available which will last until July, it is desirable that they should be supplemented.

5. It seems clear that the domestic allotment plan is wholly unworkable. It will do far greater harm than good to agriculture.

Pending the return of the great commercial countries to the gold standard and the consequent increase in world consumption and thus rise in world prices, it is essential temporarily to reduce farm production so as to remove the back-breaking surpluses of agricultural products and thus to raise agricultural income. The plan proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture some time since for temporary leasing of marginal lands is the least harmful and the most hopeful of all the plans which have been proposed. It has the merit of direct action in reducing supply to demand and thus unquestionably increasing prices; it would affect all farm products; give equal benefits to all farmers; is free of increased bureaucracy; very much less costly; and could be covered by a manufacturers' excise tax of probably 1 to 2 per cent upon these commodities. It would also largely eliminate the tax and interest problems which the Congress is seeking to solve at much greater cost.

6. I earnestly recommend repeal of the procedure of the House of Representatives in publishing loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. These transactions should be open to the fullest degree to the Representatives of the Congress, but their publication in the last few months has led to widespread, mostly innocent misinterpretation, vicious in effect, by depositors and alarmists who do not recognize that such borrowings represent an endeavor of the institution to provide funds needed in service to their respective communities. This publication is destroying the usefulness and effectiveness of the Reconstruction Corporation, is exaggerating fears, and is introducing new elements of grave danger. It is drying up the very sources of credit. The effect of such publication is forcing payment by distressed debtors to replenish bank funds. It is causing the hoarding of currency.

7. While the Congress could not enact such a law during this session, I recommend that it should institute an inquiry with view to the early expansion of the home-loan discount banks into a general mortgage-discount system to be owned cooperatively by banks and mortgage companies (with adequate encouragement of the special activities of building-and-loan associations) and thus to parallel in the field of long-time credit the service of the Federal reserve system for short-time credit. Such a system would relieve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of many of its functions, would assist in the orderly readjustment of the present situation, and through private initiative would serve many purposes for which the Congress is striving through direct action by the Government.

8. Peace would be promoted and the killing of men checked in various parts of the world to-day if the Executive had the authority to join with other nations in preventing the shipment of arms to such localities. I earnestly recommend that the legislation proposed for this purpose be enacted.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 20, 1933.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SMITH of Idaho, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. GLOVER, for the day, on account of illness.

To Mr. MONTAGUE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT FROM CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Committee on Claims, to file a supplemental report on certain bills, a list of which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The list referred to is as follows:

Supplemental report on certain bills

Title	Report	Calendar
H. R. 1938. For the relief of Katherine G. Taylor.....	1179	708
H. R. 2188. For the relief of Arthur K. Finney.....	1180	709
H. R. 3848. For the relief of Ed Symes and wife, Elizabeth Symes, and certain other citizens of the State of Texas.....	1181	710
H. R. 4064. For the relief of Sarah Maddocks Ferguson.....	1182	711
H. R. 6975. For the relief of Rufus Hunter Blackwell, Jr.....	1185	714
H. R. 7649. For the relief of Charles A. Brown.....	1186	715
H. R. 7654. For the relief of Vincent J. Conrad.....	1187	716
H. R. 10891. To provide for the reimbursement of Guillermo Medina, hydrographic surveyor, for the value of personal effects lost in the capsizing of a Navy whaleboat off Galera Island, Gulf of Panama.....	1189	718
H. R. 919. For the relief of Charles J. Eisenhauer.....	1231	741
H. R. 2453. For the relief of Mary E. Roney.....	1303	763
H. R. 2045. For the relief of Frances O. Sperry.....	1328	772
H. R. 4154. For the relief of Ruby F. Volles.....	1329	773
H. R. 6739. For the relief of Jacob Durrenberger.....	1332	776
H. R. 7324. For the relief of the mayor and aldermen of Jersey City, Hudson County, N. J., a municipal corporation.....	1333	777
H. R. 8189. For the relief of K. S. Szymanski.....	1334	778
H. R. 8215. For the relief of the National Bank of Commerce, El Dorado, Ark.....	1335	779
H. R. 8217. For the relief of the First National Bank of El Dorado, Ark.....	1336	780
H. R. 9339. Authorizing the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Ingenio Porvenir C. por A., and to render judgment for just compensation.....	1337	781
H. R. 9862. For the relief of the estate of Oscar F. Lackey.....	1338	782
H. R. 10169. Authorizing the adjustment of the claim of the Adelphi Bank & Trust Co., of Philadelphia.....	1339	783
H. R. 10406. For the relief of the Allegheny Forging Co.....	1340	784
H. R. 10407. For the relief of the Allegheny Forging Co.....	1341	785
H. R. 10408. For the relief of the Allegheny Forging Co.....	1342	786
H. R. 10973. For the relief of Augustus Thompson.....	1344	788
H. R. 11902. For the relief of Robert D. Baldwin.....	1346	790
S. 287. An act to compensate Harriet C. Holaday.....	1347	791
S. 631. An act for the relief of Alice M. A. Damm.....	1348	792
H. R. 10800. For the relief of Joe Setton.....	1405	817
H. R. 627. For the relief of the city of Glendale, Calif.....	1447	834
H. R. 1806. For the relief of M. Aileen Offerman.....	1448	835
H. R. 9633. For the relief of Grace P. Stark.....	1453	840
S. 1088. An act for the relief of Cornelia Claiborne.....	1458	844
S. 3191. An act for the relief of Anne B. Slocum.....	1459	845
H. R. 2609. For the relief of Anna Volker.....	1466	847
H. R. 6890. For the relief of the Northwest Missouri Fair Association of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.....	1469	850
H. R. 8625. For the relief of Cora A. Bennett.....	1496	866
H. R. 1950. For the relief of Lottie Bryant Steel.....	1516	876
H. R. 7046. For the relief of John S. Cathcart.....	1524	884
H. R. 9775. For the relief of Harry L. Haberkorn.....	1570	909
H. R. 5209. For the relief of Moses Israel.....	1598	924
H. R. 11869. To amend the act of Mar. 2, 1929, conferring jurisdiction upon certain courts of the United States to hear and determine the claim by the owner of the steamship W. I. Radcliffe against the United States, and for other purposes.....	1604	930
S. 4379. An act for the relief of Yvonne Hale.....	1607	933
H. R. 2814. For the relief of Bernard McShane.....	1661	956
H. R. 3840. For the relief of Oswald H. Halford, Hunter M. Henry, William C. Horne, Rupert R. Johnson, David L. Lacey, William Z. Lee, Fenton F. Rodgers, Henry Freeman Seale, Felix M. Smith, Edwin C. Smith, Robert S. Sutherland, and Charles G. Ventress.....	1663	958
H. R. 5171. For the relief of G. T. Fleming.....	1666	961
H. R. 5173. For the relief of J. B. Trotter.....	1667	962
H. R. 2481. Making appropriation to restore water of high mineral content on land owned and controlled by the Federal Government.....	1720	987
H. R. 7096. For the relief of the Dallas County Chapter of the American Red Cross.....	1797	996
H. R. 11495. For the relief of Elsie Segar, administratrix of C. M. A. Sorensen, and of Holger E. Sorensen.....	1798	997
H. R. 12351. For the relief of Guy M. Kinman.....	1799	998
S. 1738. An act for the relief of Caterina Pollino.....	1801	999
H. R. 2730. For the relief of Willard F. Holteon.....	1829	1013
H. R. 2462. For the relief of Thelma Lucy Rounds.....	1930	1037

¹ Union Calendar.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 211. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the resolution

heretofore made, the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 21, 1933, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

946. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$10,000, fiscal year 1933-34, and drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the legislative establishment (H. Doc. No. 559), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. AYRES: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 14724. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13970) granting a pension to Mary Wyse Benson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 14724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 14725) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to grant a permit for the construction of an oil and gasoline pipe line; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 14726) authorizing conventions in the States for consideration of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States submitted by the Congress to such conventions on February 20, 1933, and providing for their procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIROVICH: A bill (H. R. 14727) to provide protection for textiles and other designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 14728) to provide for conventions in the several States for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 211, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to defray the expenses thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 14729) to authorize the acceptance by the Treasury of silver bullion and the issuance thereof of silver certificates for the purpose of correcting the dislocation of exchanges, elevating the price level, and maintaining the gold standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 390) authorizing the appointment of a committee to investigate the earnings and expenditures of the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 604) to present thanks of Congress and a gold medal of honor to Mrs. W. F. Cross, of Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 605) relating to leave with pay earned by certain civilian employees of the United States Government prior to June 30, 1932; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) to authorize the printing of the first edition of the Congressional Directory of the first session of the Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing Congress to broaden the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorial of the Council of Sheboygan, Wis., protesting against any Federal taxation which imposes a burden upon States, State agencies, municipalities, or municipally owned utilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the Council of Tooele City, Utah, memorializing Congress to enact a law giving municipalities the same right enjoyed by national banks to receive national currency on the pledge of their bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorial in the nature of a resolution, adopted by the United States Conference of Mayors, requesting that Congress amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing Congress to enact House bill 11816; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Memorial of the Board of Aldermen of Newport, R. I., memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 191; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing Congress to amend Senate bill 1197 so as to include ranchers and livestock owners and enact the amended bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorial of the Council of West Allis, Wis., memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 191; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Memorial of the Council of the City of Cheyenne, Wyo., memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 191; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Memorial of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing Congress not to enact H. R. 13558; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 14730) granting an increase of pension to Florence G. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14731) granting a pension to Clifford Lamer Otto; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14732) granting a pension to Jane Bollinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 14733) for the relief of William Henry Mantz; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14734) for the relief of Nicholas Vuolo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14735) for the relief of Samuel Keller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 14736) for the relief of William Harnick; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 14737) granting a pension to Oscar B. St. John; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STULL: A bill (H. R. 14738) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEST: A bill (H. R. 14739) granting an increase of pension to Viola S. Whitten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10542. By Mr. ARENTZ: Memorial of Legislature of Nevada, memorializing Congress not to pass H. R. 13558, relative to filing of notices of location of mining claims in United States General Land Office; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

10543. Also, memorial of Legislature of State of Nevada, memorializing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to reduce the interest rate on, and to extend the time for payment of agricultural and livestock loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

10544. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of Michigan State Legislature, favoring the purchase of American-made goods by purchasing agents of the State, and all municipalities, and so forth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10545. By Mr. BOEHNE: Petition of Anna Hyslop, of Francisco, Ind., and others, urging support of the stop-alien representation amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10546. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, urging an appropriation to permit the completion of the topographical survey of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10547. By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jackson, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10548. By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: Memorial of the Wyoming State Legislature, urging immediate action to regulate interstate commercial motor-vehicle traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10549. Also, memorial of Hon. J. F. Weybrecht, mayor of Cheyenne, and the City Council of Cheyenne, requesting Congress to issue postage stamps in honor of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko sesquicentennial anniversary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10550. Also, memorial of the Wyoming State Legislature, urging passage of Senate bill 1043; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

10551. Also, memorial of the Wyoming State Legislature, urging the National Park Service to maintain the public roads in Yellowstone National Park so as to permit winter travel thereon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

10552. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, requesting the Congress of the United States to provide appropriations to permit the completion of the topographical survey of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10553. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of North Tonawanda, State of New York, urging the Congress to enact legislation providing for authorization to the Postmaster General to issue a special series of postage stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the naturalization as an American citizen and appointment of Thaddeus Kosciuszko as brevet brigadier general of the Continental Army, on October 13, 1783; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

10554. Also, petition of the Bronxville Chapter of the Westchester County Realty Board, urging Congress to designate a committee to study the merits of a plan that has for its purpose the making of Federal loans to States and municipalities to make it possible for them to spread the payment of two-thirds of one year's taxes over succeeding years and to provide for guarantee of mortgages on homes and other real estate at the present value, on condition that the mortgagee shall reduce the interest rate and extend the payment of principal of such mortgages for a definite period; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10555. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of 226 citizens of Washington, opposing the return of the liquor traffic in any form in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10556. By Mr. DRANE: Petition of citizens of Polk County, Fla., protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10557. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of J. B. Murray, of Yonkers, N. Y., petitioning the maintenance of our protective air service at the peak of efficiency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10558. Also, petition of the American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies, urging the consideration of the Eslick bill, making it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence and the incitement of assassination of public officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10559. By Mrs. ESLICK: Petition of 47 citizens of Erin, Tenn., opposing modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10560. Also, petition of 157 citizens of the seventh congressional district of Tennessee, opposing modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10561. Also, petition of 26 citizens of Prospect, Giles County, Tenn., opposing modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10562. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of C. H. Oringderff, Alva, Okla., urging enactment of legislation to refinance farm-mortgage indebtedness; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10563. Also, petition of John B. Trevor, chairman of the board, on behalf of the American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic, and Fraternal Societies, urging immediate action upon the Eslick bill, making it a crime to advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and the incitement to assassination of public officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10564. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of the Mid-Winter Conference of the American Legion, Department of Vermont, held in Brattleboro, Vt., adopting the following resolution and submitting it for the earnest and sympathetic consideration of the Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

10565. Also, petition of the Burlington Post, No. 2, American Legion, Department of Vermont, regarding national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

10566. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Reserve, Kans., urging the establishment of a Federal motion-picture commission and the regulation and control of the motion-picture industry by that body; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10567. Also, petition of William Seifert and 103 other citizens of Leavenworth County, Kans., urging legislation that would provide for the direct loaning of money on property by the Government and for a refinancing program, to prevent foreclosures, at an interest rate of 1½ per cent per annum and the principal to be reduced at the rate of 1½ per cent per annum payable directly to the Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10568. By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolution of the Bronxville Chapter of the Westchester County Realty Board, Bronxville, N. Y., referring to a plan for tax and mortgage interest relief; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10569. By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of Sunday schools of Wyoming County, Pa., protesting against all legislation in-

tended to nullify, weaken, or repeal the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10570. By Mr. PERSON: Petition of Edward A. Kaufman and seven other residents of Dearborn, Mich., favoring the revaluation of the gold ounce; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

10571. Also, concurrent resolution of the State Legislature of Michigan, relative to purchasing American-made goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10572. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich., favoring the recognition of the memory of Brig. Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko by the issuing of a special series of postage stamps; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

10573. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Polish-American citizens of Manchester, N. H., favoring recognition of the Soviet Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10574. Also, petition of Mary Torr Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Rochester, N. H., opposing recognition of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10575. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Bronxville Chapter of the Westchester County Realty Board, Bronxville, N. Y., favoring reduced mortgage interest, spreading two-thirds of 1 year's State and local taxes over 10 years, and extending for a definite period the due date of all mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10576. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of the New Jersey American Legion, opposing the Bratton amendment to Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill pertaining to veterans, and memorial from the Senate of New Jersey, favoring appropriation by Congress of sufficient funds to carry out national defense act of 1920 and accompanying provisions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10577. By Mr. STALKER: Petition of Ruth Wentz, secretary, Chemung Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Chemung; Gladys Lewis, secretary, Riverside Methodist Episcopal Church Friendly Group, Elmira; and Mrs. Charles Becker, secretary, Women's Home Missionary Society of the Riverside Methodist Episcopal Church, Elmira, all of the State of New York, opposing the return of beer and the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10578. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of Charles H. Bush and other residents of Westfield, Mass., urging the elimination of aliens in making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10579. Also, petition of Nellie L. Northam and other residents of Westfield, Mass., urging the elimination of aliens in making future apportionments for congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10580. By Mr. WITHROW: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress for higher tariff on dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10581. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the nomination of candidates for the President and Vice President in a primary election; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.